1. **Introduction**

1.1 A key stage in the production of a Local Development Plan is the Candidate Site process. The Local Development Plan Manual advises that early consideration should be given to engagement with developers and landowners to obtain information on potential sites not already identified in Joint Housing Land Availability Studies (discussed in TAN1). This is to avoid a substantial number of additional sites coming forward at the examination stage, and to ensure that the LDP strategy is deliverable.

1.2 The call for candidate sites stage was undertaken from 20 March – 6 May 2009. There were a total of 124 Candidate Sites received by the Council during the consultation period. The report in Appendix 1 of this paper sets out the representations received. The Council response to each representation sets out any required changes for accuracy purposes and comments received from organisations that provided information for each site, those organisations including internal Council departments, Welsh Water and the Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust. The report also sets out the Council’s summary of intention for the site and sustainability recommendations as set out in the Initial Sustainability Report (ISAR) undertaken by Atkins in 2010.

1.3 In order to satisfy this requirement the Council set out a three staged approach:

1. Call for Major Candidate Sites (September – October 2008)
2. Candidate Site Criteria (November – December 2008)
3. Call for Candidate Sites (March – May 2009)

The process for each stage is set out in more detail below.

2. **Call for Major Candidate Sites**

2.1 The call for major candidate sites was made as part of the evidence gathering stage in the preparation of the Newport Local Development Plan. A six week period was given for submission of such sites from 10 September to 22 October 2008.

2.2 Major sites were defined in accordance with the plan’s Delivery Agreement as those sites that could deliver key elements of what could be a potential strategy for the plan, and which therefore need to be considered early on while the strategy is evolving. As such, the submissions were made on the representor’s assessment of the significance of their site, and all submissions are included in the register without assessment as to how far they meet the definition.

2.3 A register of the sites received was published on the Council’s website and proposers were informed of the opportunity to support them with the detailed information during the call for candidate sites stage undertaken in March 2009. The Council received 75 Major Candidate Site submissions as part of the consultation process.
3. **Candidate Site Criteria**

3.1 The Council developed criteria (see Appendix 2 for full details) which set out the type of information that was required in the formal call for candidate sites, and was prepared in the light of Welsh Assembly guidance.

3.2 The criteria was subject to a six week public consultation period. During that period 20 representations were received. The finalised criteria were then provided as the level of information required at the call for candidate sites stage undertaken in March 2009.

4. **Call for Candidate Sites**

4.1 The call for candidate sites stage was undertaken from 20 March – 6 May 2009. The process required detailed information for all sites (as set out in the criteria), whether already submitted as major candidate sites, or as a new submission.

4.2 A Candidate Site is considered to be a site that someone wishes to propose to the council for inclusion in the Local Development Plan. Any use of land can be proposed, and this could be for development, for safeguarding or protecting land from development. Each Candidate Site submission was made up of a completed a Candidate Site Criteria Form and provided a red line plan.

4.3 There was a total of 124 Candidate Sites received by the Council during the consultation period. A register was then made available setting out the location and details submitted as required by the Candidate Site Criteria.

4.4 Following the publication of the Register the Council consulted with relevant organisations e.g. Environment Agency, Welsh Water, Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust and internal Council departments. The information gathered was then used to form the basis of the Candidate Site assessment and subsequent decision making tool for allocations within the Local Development Plan.

4.5 In addition to the information received by respondents and subsequently gathered by the Council, a Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken on the majority of sites. Some sites were excluded from this assessment, the reasons for this including that they were small, they were infill sites within the urban area, they did not have particular land use implications, or that they were undeveloped parts of existing developments. The full details of this assessment can be found in Chapter 9 of the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report, and the recommendations have been set out in the Council response in Appendix 1 and were used to form the basis of the site allocation decision making process for the LDP.

---

1 The Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report can be viewed at: http://www.newport.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/plans_and_strategies/cont448605.pdf
Appendix 1 – Candidate Site Responses and Council Response
### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

It should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted. The area of woodland TPO (mixed deciduous) should be retained and linkages to the wider ecological system maintained. It is recommended that development leads to the enhancement of green infrastructure, and as such, this should be designed into the allocation. Any potential contamination on the previously developed portion of the site should be investigated and remediated where necessary ahead of development. If development is to proceed it should be proved ahead of development that no negative effects on the watercourse will arise as a result. Site is sensitive development in a known flood risk area. Subject to the revisions to TAN 15, it should be ensured that development will not increase the risk of flooding to people or property subject to advice from the EA. Site contains a listed building: it is recommended that the setting and value of the listed building are enhanced through the development of the site.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

Outline planning permission was granted on appeal by the Welsh Government for residential development, public open space, flood alleviation works and associated environmental improvements during 2007 (Ref: 03/1763). An application for variation of condition 2 (submission of reserved matters) was granted planning permission during November 2009 (Ref: 09/0096). Both planning permissions were subject to a S106 agreement (which have been signed) for a number of contributions including, education contribution, a financial contribution to the provision of a Sustrans Cycle Route, provision of open space, flood alleviation works and affordable housing provision. Given that the site has an extant planning permission, the residential element of the candidate site will be included in the Local Development Plan as a housing commitment. The remaining part of the site will be designated as an Environmental Space and Special Landscape Area reflecting its landscape, amenity and ecological value. The site is a visibly prominent gateway site adjacent to the M4 motorway and provides a well used area of open space with Public Rights of Way running through it. The land is identified as an area of high value in the LANDMAP assessment and forms part of the Tredegar Park Special Landscape Area. The Afon Ebw River SINC also runs through the site. The proposed route of the Sustrans cycle network will also be allocated on the candidate site. These designations are consistent with the planning permission granted by the Welsh Government on appeal and the associated S106 Agreements, including the transfer of land to the Council for use as recreational/open space. The site lies within zone C2 as defined by the development advice maps (dam) referred to under TAN15. However, flood alleviation measures have been agreed as part of the planning application appeal granted permission by the Welsh Government (ref: 03/1763).

### Question: Site Name

**Representation Text:**

Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

### Question: Location

**Representation Text:**

Former Tredegar Park Golf Course, Forge Road, Bassaleg

### Question: Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**

ST 283 867
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Residential Development of former Tredegar Park Golf Course

**Council Response:**

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
- **Representation Text:** 40.7ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- **Representation Text:** Former Golf Course Features

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text:** Former Golf Course (Vacant)

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text:** Residential (200 units) & Public Open Space

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** Non-managed vacant golf course. The site is well contained by strong boundaries and development would not be intrusive.
  
  Countryside comments:
  Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and well used open space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Part of area within proposed SLA 7 Tredegar Park is part of former estate and part of the setting of the Tredegar house. Historic, Ecological, Tree, flooding & PROW issues. Blue land is within CADW register of Historic Parks and Gardens.

  **Council Response:** This is a visually prominent gateway site adjacent to the M4 motorway. Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and well used open space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Part of area within proposed SLA 7 Tredegar Park is part of former estate and part of the setting of the Tredegar house. Historic, Ecological, Tree, flooding & PROW issues. Blue land is within CADW register of Historic Parks and Gardens.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:** Candidate Site for Residential Development of former Tredegar Park Golf Course

**Council Response:**

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- Yes.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- Yes.
- Representation Text: Provision of public open space which could assist

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- No.
- Representation Text: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Part of Park to Tredegar House. Crossed by tram line including bridge that is a listed building Restraint Archaeological assessment produced. Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- Yes. Zone C2 - Although development of the site linked to flood defence works on site below.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- Yes. Ebbw River

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- No.
- Representation Text: Afon Ebbw River SINC.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- No.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development of former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation Text: Yes. Bats and otters possibly along the river corridor.

Council Response: 'There is a species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre'.

Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: 1 Listed building.
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

Representation Text: Yes. There is an approved planning application for a principal access onto Park View. The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

Council Response: Yes- Park View
T.A to confirm suitability + capacity of access and surrounding network.
Currently assessed for 450 units, traffic impact to be assessed over and above number of units consented.
No access to Forge Road.

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

Representation Text: The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.

Council Response: There is a outline application on this site that has already won an appeal against the City Council. The plans include the provision of 3 outdoor pitches and changing facilities and car parking for 40 vehicles. The development will however impact existing Tredegar Park as flood alleviation works will reduce the parks size and visual outlook. The development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha and although the development will provide outdoor play space it will still add to the overall deficit by increasing the local population.

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

Representation Text: The development would be served by a reasonable level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located adjacent to the site.

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

Representation Text: 100m from the site on Park View.

Council Response: Park view- Site frontage.

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

Representation Text: 21 buses per hour (service numbers 50, 51, 151, X16 & X18)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development of former Tredegar Park Golf Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:** 30min freq

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Representation Text:** Newport Station is circa 3.5km.
- **Council Response:** Newport 3.5km

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** 600m to a parade of shops located at Laurel Road. Four shops (Nisa Local Foodstore, Bassaleg Pharmacy, Fish Bar and Hair Salon) also a Post Office on Caerphilly Road.
- **Council Response:** Green meadow Rd 800m
  Laurel rd shops 650m-1km

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:**
  - Whiteheads Sports and Social Club is adjacent to the site.
  - Bassaleg Comprehensive School is circa 500m from the site.
  - Tregwilym Industrial Estate is circa 750m from the site.
  - Cleppa Park and Tredegar Park employment areas approx 1km away are accessible via footpaths and cycleways.
- **Council Response:**

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** £250,000 contribution in unilateral towards Sustrans Cycle Network which completes the missing link of this important local & national transport network.
- **Council Response:**

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. To the south of the site and western boundary.
- **Council Response:** 393/119, 120, 121

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?
- **Representation Text:** Tredegar Park Sports Ground is adjacent to the site.
- **Council Response:**

### Question: 5.1 Schools?
- **Representation Text:**
  - Bassaleg Comprehensive - 0.5km
  - PentrePorth Primary School - 1.3km
  - Whitehead Sports and Social Club adjacent
  - Highcross Primary School - 1.3km
- **Council Response:** PentrePorth Primary School is about 1.5km.
**Community Engagement?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Yes. Site already has outline planning consent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Aspirations?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Redevelopment of vacant site to provide new residential dwellings and public open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Former golf course has already closed and development of the site provides the opportunity for improved public open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure Proximity?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighbouring Development Issues?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Welsh Water Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Residential Development of former Tredegar Park Golf Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site already has outline planning consent. Infill development.</td>
<td>The site is within the existing urban boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stand alone development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.2 Site Owner?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Tredegar Park Sports Ground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. 1-3 years. Site already has outline planning consent (03/1763) for residential development &amp; public open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Removal of site from Environmental Space designation.</td>
<td>Only part of the site would need to have the Environmental Space designation removed for the consented development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. 03/1763 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE) AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATH 393/121 &amp; 393/119 00/0080 08/12/2000 REFUSED ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Objects to proposal as site falls within flood plain and proposal would be contrary to Government Guidance and Environment Agency Policy in respect to both flood risk and loss of landscape, conservation and amenity value. The Head of Engineering and Construction has indicated that the existing highway network is of sufficient capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development of former Tredegar Park Golf Course

- **ERECUTION OF 25M HIGH TELECOMMUNICATION LATTICE TOWER, EQUIPMENT CABIN, METER CABINET AND 1.8M SECURITY FENCE**
  00/1370 14/02/2001 GRANTED

- **ERECUTION OF 27.5M HIGH LATTICE TOWER, ASSOCIATED DISHES AND ANTENNAE AND AN EQUIPMENT CABINET**
  03/1667 16/01/2004 GRANTED

None relevant

- **DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING LOCAL CENTRE AND PRIMARY SCHOOL INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS**
  93/0206 25/02/1994 REFUSED

  In basement

- **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, FLOOD ALLEVIATION WORKS AND ASSOCIATED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY 393/120 AND 393/121 (REVISED ACCESS DETAILS) (OUTLINE)**
  03/1763 22/03/2007 GRANTED BY THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

  Planning permission was refused for the development by Newport City Council in 2/02/2005 the application was then called in by the welsh assembly where it was granted

- **HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (COUNTRYSIDE):** Part of the site has been identified as the River Ebbw candidate site of importance for Nature Conservation, and the river itself flows into the River Usk which is an SSSI and SAC. Development of locally designated sites will only be permitted in accordance with Policy CE7 of the Deposit Unitary Development Plan (Second Proposed Changes) where there will be no significant adverse effect on nature conservation and there are demonstrable reasons for the proposal which outweigh the need to safeguard the nature conservation value of the site and appropriate mitigation or compensation measures can be achieved.

  ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: the development of this site is wholly inappropriate and should not be permitted.

- **FLOOD ALLEVIATION WORKS AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATH NO. 393/121**
  02/0140 29/05/2003 REFUSED

  ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Object to the proposed development on the grounds that it is unlikely that formal consent of the Agency

  Applications on adjacent land.

- **REPLACE M4 JUNCTION WITH A SERIES OF SMALLER SIGNAL CONTROLLED JUNCTIONS AND IMPROVE A48 BETWEEN CELTIC LAKES AND CLEPPA PARK – GRANTED**
  18/11/2009 - 04/0586

- **HOUSING AND ASSOCIATED USES INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS**
  94/0521 06/01/1997 APPEAL DISSMISSSED

  IN BASEMENT

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** The planning permission was given on appeal by the Welsh Assembly.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development of former Tredegar Park Golf Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representative Text:
09/0096 - Section 73 Variation of Condition 2 (submission of reserved matters).

Question: 9 Map Included?
Representation Text: Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: 23/ Chartist Drive (Land off), Rogerstone (1) New Site

Issue:

Question: SA Recommendation
Council Response: Potential increase in air and noise pollution if site is used for residential development - it is recommended that the site is development for commercial purposes (employment or retail). The use of the site for either of these purposes may also help to reduce inequalities. In this case, employment uses are recommended.

Question: Overall Council Response
Council Response: The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations are therefore not required. It is recommended that the candidate site is not allocated for housing in the Local Development Plan.

Question: 2.1 Site Name
Representation Text: Land off Chartist Drive (rear of Focus DIY), Rogerstone (1)

Question: 2.2 Location
Representation Text: Land off Chartist Drive, Rogerstone, NP10 9XJ

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
Representation Text: ST 270 882
Council Response: 326910 188212

Question: 2.4 Site Area
Representation Text: 2.31ha
Council Response: 1.69 ha
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>Accessn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

Representation Text: Level plateau within the urban boundary surrounded by development.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

Representation Text: Vacant land

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text: Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

Representation Text: Yes. Former railway sidings

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Representation Text: Site is currently surrounded by existing built development. Development would not be intrusive within settlement boundary and urban infill.

Council Response: Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplan will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

Representation Text: Yes. Along the south/west boundary with the A467. Not protected as far as we are aware of.

Council Response: Potential TPOs.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

Representation Text: Limited landscape features on site. Possible retention of tree line on southern boundary with A467.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

Representation Text: No.
Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Crossed by line of railway. No other archaeological features known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
Representation Text: Yes. Spot contamination from former use to be removed to landfill and / or capped in situ.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.7 SSSI?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
Representation Text: No. Not that we are aware of.

Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Listed building n/a Ancient monuments n/a historic park n/a conservation area n/a Within Newport boundary

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

Representation Text:
The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.

Council Response:
The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. This particular site is isolated by a major highway on one side and an industrial area on the other making it a concern for parents to allow children to walk to the nearest play provision, which is approximately 700m away. The local highway infrastructure does not have any controlled crossing points on route. The shape of the site is likely to limit the developer’s ability to provide a suitable play facility on site which would be the ideal solution.

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

Representation Text:
The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

Council Response:

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

Representation Text:
300m located on Chartist Drive.

Council Response:
tregwilyn rd 750m

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

Representation Text:
14 buses per hour (Service Numbers 5, 56, R1, R3 & R6).

Council Response:
10 min freq

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

Representation Text:
Rogertestone Station 2.7km from site.

Council Response:
rogerstone 3.1km
newport 4.8km

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

Representation Text:
750m to a parade of shops and Post Office on Ebenezer Drive.

Council Response:
st johns crescent 1.4km
rogerstone primary school 750m
ebeneezor drive 750m

Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
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Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

Representation Text:
- There is an existing combined footway/ cycleway on Chartist Drive.

Council Response:
- Safe routes to school scheme
- Poor footway links from site.

Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

Representation Text:
- No.

Question: 4.9 Open Space?

Representation Text:
- 1.1km to a recreation ground off Tregwilym Road and 0.3km to Community Centre at Cefn Wood.

Council Response:
- 0.5km to Cefn Wood.

Question: 5.1 Schools?

Representation Text:
- Yes. Mount Pleasant Primary - 0.8km
- Cefn Wood School - 0.3km
- Bassaleg School - 2km.

Council Response:
- Cefn Wood School 0.5km.
- Mount Pleasant School 1.5km.

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

Representation Text:
- No.

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

Representation Text:
- Improved mix and choice of housing.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

Representation Text:
- No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Representation Text:
- The site is adjacent to the existing built development where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text:
- No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**

Welsh Water Comments

**Council Response:**

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**

It would be an infill development of white land.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

Stand alone development.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.4**  Restrictive Covenants?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5**  Realistic Timescale?
- Representation Text: Yes. Yes - 1-3 years.

**Question: 7.6**  Development Boundary Change?
- Representation Text: No. No change to boundary and currently designated as white land.

**Question: 7.7**  Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: PROPOSED RETAIL DEVELOPMENT 95/0368 04/08/1995 GRANTED

**Question: 7.8**  Planning Application Refusals?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9**  Planning Applications Pending?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 9**  Map Included?
- Representation Text: Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retail Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: 23/ Chartist Drive (Land off), Rogerstone (1)  New Site

Issue:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retail Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:** Potential increase in air and noise pollution if site is used for residential development - it is recommended that the site is development for commercial purposes (employment or retail). The use of the site for either of these purposes may also help to reduce inequalities. In this case, employment uses are recommended.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:** Planning Policy Wales is clear in promoting a city centre first approach to the consideration of retail proposals. Furthermore, there is no identified need for additional retail floorspace in Newport outside of the city centre (Collier International Retail Study, July 2010). It is therefore recommended that this site is not allocated for retail use.

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land off Chartist Drive (rear of Focus DIY), Rogerstone (2)

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Land off Chartist Drive (rear of Focus DIY), Rogerstone, NP10 9XJ

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 270 882

**Council Response:** 326910 188212

**Question:** 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** 2.31ha

**Council Response:** 1.69ha.

**Question:** 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** Level plateau within the urban boundary surrounded by development.

**Question:** 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:** Vacant land.

**Question:** 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:** Retail.

**Question:** 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Former railway sidings.
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### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:**

- Site is currently surrounded by existing built development.
- Development would not be intrusive within settlement boundary and urban infill.

**Council Response:**

- countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Along the south/west boundary with the A467.
- Not protected as far as we are aware.

**Council Response:**

- Potential TPOs.

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**

- Limited landscape features on site.
- Possible retention of tree line on southern boundary with A467.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**

- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Crossed by line of railway. No other archaeological features known.
- No reason for not allocating in LDP

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

- Spot contamination from former use to be removed to landfill and / or capped in situ.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

---

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Retail Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C3</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retail Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations Text:**

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** No. Not that we are aware of.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

**Within Newport boundary**

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site is served by an existing access road (also shared with the Focus DIY store) that connects with the B4591 Chartist Drive roundabout. The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

**Council Response:**
- Yes- access road unadopted. A467/chartist drive/ tregwilyn rd roundabout.
- Yes transport statement.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.

**Council Response:**
- The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. This particular site is isolated by a major highway on one side and an industrial area on the other making it a concern for parents to allow children to walk to the nearest play provision, which is approximately 700m away. The local highway infrastructure does not have any controlled crossing points on route. The shape of the site is likely to limit the developer’s ability to provide a suitable play facility on site which would be the ideal solution.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retail Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.2** Bus Route?

- **Representation Text:** 300m located on Chartist Drive.
- **Council Response:** tregwilyn rd 750m

**Question: 4.3** Bus Frequency?

- **Representation Text:** 14 buses per hour (Service Numbers 5, 56, R1, R3 & R6)
- **Council Response:** 10 min freq

**Question: 4.4** Railway Station?

- **Representation Text:** Rogerstone Station 2.7km from site.
- **Council Response:** newport 4.8km rogerstone 3.1km

**Question: 4.5** Convenience Shop?

- **Representation Text:** 750m to a parade of shops and Post Office on Ebenezer Drive.
- **Council Response:** st johns crescent shop, p.o. etc 1.4km ebeneezor drive shop, p.o takeaway 740m

**Question: 4.6** Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

- **Representation Text:** Cefn Wood School is 300m from the site; Wern Industrial Estate is adjacent and Tregwilym Road Industrial Estate 400m.

**Question: 4.7** Walking and Cycling?

- **Representation Text:** There is an existing combined footway/ cycleway on Chartist Drive.
- **Council Response:** poor flyway links on access rd.

**Question: 4.8** Public Rights of Way?

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.9** Open Space?

- **Representation Text:** 1.1km to a recreation ground off Tregwilym Road and 0.3km to Community Centre at Cefn Wood.
- **Council Response:** 0.5km to Cefn Wood.

**Question: 5.1** Schools?
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### Question: 5.2  Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 5.3  Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:**
Additional retail facilities.

### Question: 5.4  Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.1  Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:**
The site is adjacent to the existing built development where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.

### Question: 6.2  Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.3  Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Council Response:**
Welsh Water Comments

#### Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated within the public sewerage system.

#### Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C3</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retail Development of site rear of Focus DIY, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sewerage treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Retail use proposed on site approx 100m from nearest residential properties on other side of A467.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** It would be an infill development of white land.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** Stand alone development.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Yes - 1-3 years.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** No. No change to boundary and currently designated as white land.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.
### Questions and Representations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.8** Planning Application Refusals?

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.9** Planning Applications Pending?

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 9** Map Included?

*Representation Text:* Yes.

---

### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Commercial Development off Chartist Drive.

*New Site*

**Issue:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Representation Text:*

- Land off Chartist Drive (rear of Focus DIY), Rogerstone (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Representation Text:*

- Land off Chartist Drive (rear of Focus DIY), Rogerstone, NP10 9XJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Grid Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Representation Text:*

- ST 270 882

*Council Response:*

- 326910 188212

---

**Question: 2.1** Site Name

*Representation Text:*

- Land off Chartist Drive (rear of Focus DIY), Rogerstone (3)

**Question: 2.2** Location

*Representation Text:*

- Land off Chartist Drive (rear of Focus DIY), Rogerstone, NP10 9XJ

**Question: 2.3** Grid Reference

*Representation Text:*

- ST 270 882

*Council Response:*

- 326910 188212

---

### Council Responses

**Junction 8**: Potential increase in air and noise pollution if site is used for residential development - it is recommended that the site is developed for commercial purposes (employment or retail). The use of the site for either of these purposes may also help to reduce inequalities. In this case, employment uses are recommended.

**Overall Council Response**: These former sidings are recommended for inclusion within the Local Development Plan for employment use.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation Text: 2.31ha.
Council Response: 1.69ha.

**Question: 2.5** Brief Description

Representation Text: Level plateau within the urban boundary surrounded by development.

**Question: 2.6** Current Use

Representation Text: Vacant Land.

**Question: 2.7** Proposed Use(s)

Representation Text: Commercial

**Question: 3.1** Brownfield?

Representation Text: Yes. Former railway sidings.

**Question: 3.10** Minerals Safeguarding Area?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11** Agricultural Land?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.12** Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

Representation Text: Site is currently surrounded by existing built development. Development would not be intrusive within settlement boundary and urban infill.

Council Response: countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13** Trees and Hedgerows?

Representation Text: Yes. Along the south' west boundary with the A467. Not protected as far as we are aware.

Council Response: Potential TPOs.

**Question: 3.14** Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

Representation Text: Limited landscape features on site. Possible retention of tree line on southern boundary with A467.

Summary: Candidate Site for Commercial Development off Chartist Drive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Commercial Development off Chartist Drive.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Crossed by line of railway. No other archaeological features known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Spot contamination from former use to be removed to landfill and / or capped in situ.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

- **Representation Text:** No. Not that we are aware of.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The site is served by an existing access road (also shared with the Focus DIY store) that connects with the B4591 Chartist Drive roundabout.
The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

**Council Response:**
Yes at467 chartist drive roundabout.
Access road to site.
Unadopted.
Yes transport statement req

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. This particular site is isolated by a major highway on one side and an industrial area on the other making it a concern for parents to allow children to walk to the nearest play provision, which is approximately 700m away. The local highway infrastructure does not have any controlled crossing points on route.
The shape of the site is likely to limit the developer’s ability to provide a suitable play facility on site which would be the ideal solution.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
300m located on Chartist Drive.

**Council Response:**
tregwilyn rd 750m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
14 buses per hour (Service Numbers 5, 56, R1, R3 & R6)

**Council Response:**
10 min freq

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
Rogerstone Station 2.7km from site.

**Council Response:**
rogerstone station 3.1km newport 4.8km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
750m to a parade of shops and Post Office on Ebenezer Drive.

**Council Response:**
st john crescent 1.4km
ebenezzor drive 750m
Summary: Candidate Site for Commercial Development off Chartist Drive.

Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

Representation Text: Cefn Wood School is 300m from the site; Wern Industrial Estate is adjacent and Tregwilym Road Industrial Estate 400m.

Council Response: Cefn Wood School 0.5km. Mount Pleasant School 1.5km.

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

Representation Text: There is an existing combined footway/cycleway on Chartist Drive.

Council Response: Poor links to site.

Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 4.9 Open Space?

Representation Text: 1.1km to a recreation ground off Tregwilym Road and 0.3km to Community Centre at Cefn Wood.

Council Response: Cefn Wood School 0.5km. Mount Pleasant School 1.5km.

Question: 5.1 Schools?

Representation Text: Yes. Cefn Wood School - 0.3km
Mount Pleasant Primary - 0.8km
Bassaleg School - 2km.

Council Response: Cefn Wood School 0.5km, Mount Pleasant School 1.5km.

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

Representation Text: Additional commercial facilities.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Representation Text: The site is adjacent to the existing built development where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text: No.
| Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 28.C4                                             P W M                         |                  |        |                  |                                             |

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Commercial use proposed on site approx 100m from nearest residential properties on other side of A467.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** . It would be an infill development of white land.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** . Stand alone development.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
### Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed

#### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Commercial Development off Chartist Drive.

**Representation Text:**

**Question:** 7.4  **Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 7.5  **Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Yes - 1-3 years.

**Question:** 7.6  **Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** No. No change to boundary and currently designated as white land.

**Question:** 7.7  **Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**

PROPOSED RETAIL DEVELOPMENT 95/0368 04/08/1995 GRANTED

**Question:** 7.8  **Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 7.9  **Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 9  **Map Included?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

---

**Rep’n/Para/Policy | AccessnNo | DateLodgd | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified | Summary |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Mixed Residential Development on Bassaleg Sidings.

**Site:** 4/ Bassaleg Sidings (1)  

**Issue:**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA Recommendation</td>
<td>Green infrastructure should be considered throughout the development of the site, especially as the railway corridor may be an important ecological route. It should be ensured that development does not affect the watercourse negatively. The development for elderly for accommodation and mixed residential should include the provision of a local convenience shop to ensure the development of an inclusive community. Walking/cycling routes to key local facilities should be enhanced, and connection with the national cycle trails ensured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Overall Council Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The site has planning permission for 82 residential units (10/0896) and will be included in the Local Development Plan as a housing site under construction/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Site Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Land at Bassaleg Sidings (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Bassaleg Sidings, Viaduct Way, Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Grid Reference</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>ST 276 872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>327589 187286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Site Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>2.83ha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>2.75ha.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Brief Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Flat plateau within existing settlement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Current Use</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Former Railway Sidings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Proposed Use(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Mixed Residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Brownfield?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Former Railway Sidings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Agricultural Land?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
<td>Contained former railway sidings site between new residential development and railway line. Infill development of the site would not be intrusive and would complement recent development to the north. Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape &amp; countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?</td>
<td>Yes. Along northern boundary - not protected as far as we are aware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
<td>Limited landscape features and possible buffer between development and railway line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16 Archaeology?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Greenfield?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td>Yes. Spot contamination from former use to be removed to landfill and / or capped in situ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Flood Risk?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.C5</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** No. Not adjacent but close to River Ebbw.

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Possibly otters in the River Ebbw although outside of the site.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Direct access onto Viaduct Way. The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

**Council Response:**
- Mixed residential development
- The site is not accessible for the public highway
  - Connection possible into currently adopted road- viaduct way.
  - Transport assessment proposal for development of 80 units.
  - Elderly Accommodation
  - No capacity issues.
  - Connect into Viaduct Way
  - Un-adopted
  - Prospectively adoptable.
  - Subject to planning application

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:** The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.
The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. Owing to the isolation of the site it is proposed that a LEAP be provided to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development. Although the development will provide outdoor play space it will still add to the overall deficit by increasing the local population, consequently it is proposed to request off-site contributions to improve formal play provision locally.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

Representation Text:
- The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

Representation Text:
- 400m on the A468 Forge Road.

Council Response: Caerphilly Rd- A468, @400M-600M Edge of site.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

Representation Text:
- 6 buses per hour (Service Numbers 50 & 51).

Council Response: 30 min

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

Representation Text:
- Newport Station is approx 3.5km from site.

Council Response: Newport

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

Representation Text:
- 600m to a parade of shops located at Laurel Road. Four shops (Nisa local foodstore, Bassaleg Pharmacy, Fish Bar and Hair Salon) as well as a Post Office on Caerphilly Road.

Council Response: Laurel Road shops 630m
- P.O shop.
- Bassaleg High School 450m
- Hairdressers chip shop.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

Representation Text:
- Bassaleg Comprehensive School is 500m from the site.
- Tregwilym Industrial Estate is adjacent to the site.
- Whitehead’s Sports and Social Club is 400m from the site.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

Representation Text:
- Bassaleg Comprehensive School and Tregwilym Industrial Estate are within reasonable walking and cycling distance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Pwicy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C5</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:** Links to existing infrastructure, development must _____ flyway provision.

**SRTS Scheme**

**Question:** 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.  PROW along northern boundary.

**Council Response:** 393/111

**Question:** 4.9 Open Space?

**Representation Text:**
800m to recreation and play areas to the southwest of the site.

**Question:** 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.  Bassaleg Comp. - 0.3km, Pentrepoeth Primary School - 1km, St Basil Church - 80m, Doctors - 0.4km.

**Council Response:** Bassaleg Comp - 0.4km, Pentrepoeth PS - 1.5km.

**Question:** 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question:** 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:**
Improved mix and choice of housing.

**Question:** 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question:** 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:**
The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.

**Question:** 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question:** 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage
Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
Representation Text: Logical infill urban development.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
Representation Text: Stand alone development.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
Representation Text: No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Mixed Residential Development on Bassaleg Sidings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

Representation Text: Yes. 1-3 years.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

Representation Text: No. Within settlement boundary and white land.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - OUTLINE 00/0669 03/07/2000 GRANTED HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION; Site is land locked and can only be developed in conjunction with adjacent site for which outline permission already exists.

CREASE OF REPLACEMENT FOOTBRIDGE AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY 393/111 AND 406/51 04/0919 06/2009 GRANTED

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

Representation Text: Yes.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C6</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Elderly Accommodation at Bassaleg Sidings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: 4/ Bassaleg Sidings (1) Issue: New Site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C6</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
Green infrastructure should be considered throughout the development of the site, especially as the railway corridor may be an important ecological route. It should be ensured that development does not affect the watercourse negatively. The development for elderly accommodation and mixed residential should include the provision of a local convenience shop to ensure the development of an inclusive community. Walking/cycling routes to key local facilities should be enhanced, and connection with the national cycle trails ensured.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
The site has planning permission for 82 residential units (10/0896) and will be included in the Local Development Plan as a housing site under construction.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:**
Land at Bassaleg Sidings (2)

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:**
Bassaleg Sidings, Viaduct Way, Bassaleg

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**
ST 276 872

**Council Response:**
327589 187286

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:**
2.83ha.

**Council Response:**
2.75ha.

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:**
Flat plateau within existing settlement.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:**
Former Railway Sidings.

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:**
Elderly accommodation.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Former railway sidings.
## Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**

- Contained former railway sidings site between new residential development and railway line. Infill development of the site would not be intrusive and would complement recent development to the north.

## Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:**

- Contained former railway sidings site between new residential development and railway line. Infill development of the site would not be intrusive and would complement recent development to the north.

**Council Response:**

- Countryside comments: Tree issues, knotweed and access issues

## Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Along northern boundary - not protected as far as we are aware.

**Council Response:**

- Tree Preservation Order 02/0006 - Birch and mixed deciduous woodland. Protected by TPO 2/2006 and 4 of 2006.

## Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**

- Limited landscape features and possible buffer between development and railway line.

## Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**

- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Former railway sidings, now removed. No other archaeological features known.

No other reason for not allocating in LDP.

## Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Spot contamination from former use to be removed to landfill and / or capped in situ.

## Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C6</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Elderly Accommodation at Bassaleg Sidings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?
- **Representation Text:** No. Not adjacent but close to River Ebbw.

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Possibly otters in the River Ebbw although outside of the site.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?
- **Representation Text:** No.
  - **Council Response:** Listed building n/a
    - Ancient monuments n/a
    - historic park n/a
    - conservation area n/a
    - Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Direct access onto Viaduct Way.
  - The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** .
  - The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.
  - The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. Owing to the isolation of the site it is proposed that a LEAP be provided to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development. Although the development will provide outdoor play space it will still add to the overall deficit by increasing the local population, consequently it is proposed to request off-site contributions to improve formal play provision locally.

**Question: 4.11** Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** .
  - The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C6</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>400m on the A468 Forge Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

- **Representations Text:** 400m on the A468 Forge Road.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

- **Representations Text:** 6 buses per hour (Service Numbers 50 & 51).

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

- **Representations Text:** Newport Station is approx 3.5km from site.

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

- **Representations Text:** 600m to a parade of shops located at Laurel Road. Four shops (Nisa local foodstore, Bassaleg Pharmacy, Fish Bar and Hair Salon) as well as a Post Office on Caerphilly Road.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- **Representations Text:** Bassaleg Comprehensive School is 500m from the site. Tregwilym Industrial Estate is adjacent to the site. Whitehead's Sports and Social Club is 400m from the site.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

- **Representations Text:** Bassaleg Comprehensive School and Tregwilym Industrial Estate are within reasonable walking and cycling distance.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- **Representations Text:** Yes. PROW along northern boundary.

**Council Response:** 393/111

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- **Representations Text:** 800m to recreation and play areas to the southwest of the site.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

- **Representations Text:** Yes. Bassaleg Comp. - 0.3km, Pentrepoeth Primary School - 1km, St Basil Church - 80m, Doctors - 0.4km.

- **Council Response:** Bassaleg Comprehensive School - 0.4km. Pentrepoeth Primary School - 1.5km.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

- **Representations Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.4</th>
<th>Loss of Recreational Facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.1</th>
<th>Infrastructure Proximity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.2</th>
<th>Neighbouring Development Issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.3</th>
<th>Infrastructure Capacity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Welsh Water Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.4</th>
<th>Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.5</th>
<th>Logical Extension?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Logical infill urban development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.C6</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
- **Representation Text:** Stand alone development.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. 1-3 years.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** No. Within settlement boundary and white land.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - OUTLINE 00/0669 03/07/2000 GRANTED**
- **HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION; Site is land locked and can only be developed in conjunction with adjacent site for which outline permission already exists.**
- **EXCAVATION OF RAILWAY EMBANKMENT TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO EXISTING SEWER AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATH 393/111 03/1494 12/03/2009 GRANTED**

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.C6</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Elderly Accommodation at Bassaleg Sidings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** 9

**Map Included?**

Yes.
## Penhow Community Council

### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

The proportion of housing to open space should seek to ensure the retention of local character and ecological value. This is especially the case for site 1341.C1 which includes a cSINC designation- it is recommended that the cSINC is retained as open space, and a buffer is created between development and the cSINC, as well as between development and the SSSI to the north.

- PROWs, TPOs and protected hedgerows should be enhanced throughout the sites.
- The provision of housing should include a convenience store on at least one of the sites.
- It is recommended that walking and cycling routes to key services and facilities including employment are enhanced as part of development proposals. Enhanced bus provision should also be considered to reduce the potential effect of traffic growth.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

Noted and agreed. This is considered a valuable area of environmental space. Such areas should be retained and allocated as environmental space in the LDP.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:**

Market Road Green (Land off Greenmeadow Close), Parc Seymour

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:**

Greenspace adjacent Greenmeadow Close, intersection of Greenmeadow Lane, Duckpool Lane, Wentwood Road. NP26 3AB

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**

ST 406 919

**Council Response:**

340659 191843

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Council Response:**

0.13ha.

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:**

Grassed area with seating. Sloped downwards NE → SW. Extensive views over surrounding countryside.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:**

Open Space / Recreation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Proposed Use(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td>Open Space / Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Brownfield?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Agricultural Land?</td>
<td>No. Probably in agricultural use up to late 60s / early 70s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
<td>Pleasant landscape with excellent views. Non intrusive use. Visible from surrounding housing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Countryside comments: Strategically important Public Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
<td>Retains an important open space and local resource for residents and walkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16 Archaeology?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In medieval hunting park. No other archaeological features known. No reason for not allocating LDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Greenfield?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep’n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.C1</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Retention as Green Space off Greenmeadow Close, Parc Seymour

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Listed building n/a

Ancient monuments n/a

historic park n/a

conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

Representation Text: Yes. No traffic generation.

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

Representation Text: This is a point where several established walks meet - provides a pleasant resting spot.

Council Response: The Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. This site does not currently contribute to the outdoor play provision across the City as verges and commons fall outside the definition of outdoor play as provided by Fields In Trust (formerly NPFA).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Retention as Green Space off Greenmeadow Close, Parc Seymour

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

Representation Text: None.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

Representation Text: A few metres.

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

Representation Text: Hourly.

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

Representation Text: ~ 10 miles.

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

Representation Text: ~ 100 metres. 1 shop.

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

Representation Text: Not relevant.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

Representation Text: It is and would remain a popular resting point for people undertaking long walks to the woods, or short strolls around the village.

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Public Right of Way crosses site. 402/15

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

Representation Text: This is an open space on the edge of countryside.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retention as Green Space off Greenmeadow Close, Parc Seymour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.1**

**Schools?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 5.2**

**Community Engagement?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 5.3**

**Community Aspirations?**

Representation Text: Maintenance of an existing facility secured for the future.

**Question: 5.4**

**Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.1**

**Infrastructure Proximity?**

Representation Text: Not relevant.

**Question: 6.2**

**Neighbouring Development Issues?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.3**

**Infrastructure Capacity?**

Representation Text: No. No provision required.

**Council Response:**

Welsh Water Comments:

- The green and open space allocations will have no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan.

**Question: 6.4**

**Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.5**

**Logical Extension?**

Representation Text: N/A

**Question: 6.6**

**Precedent Setting?**

Representation Text: N/A

**Question: 7.1**

**Site Owned by Proposer?**

Representation Text: No. No - owned by Newport City Council.
### Question 7.2 Site Owner?

### Question 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
- Representation Text: No.

### Question 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
- Representation Text: No.

### Question 7.5 Realistic Timescale?
- Representation Text: Not relevant.

### Question 7.6 Development Boundary Change?
- Representation Text: No.

### Question 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
- Representation Text: No.

### Question 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
- Representation Text: No.

### Question 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
- Representation Text: No.

### Question 9 Map Included?
- Representation Text: Yes.

---

### Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
51.C1 01/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Candidate Site for Retention as Green Space off Greenmeadow Close, Parc Seymour

- **Question:** Site Owner?
  - **Representation Text:** No. Community Council.

- **Question:** Interest in Adjoining Land?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** Restrictive Covenants?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** Realistic Timescale?
  - **Representation Text:** Not relevant.

- **Question:** Development Boundary Change?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** Planning Application Refusals?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** Planning Applications Pending?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** Map Included?
  - **Representation Text:** Yes.

---

### Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
51.C2 01/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Penhow Recreation Ground, Parc Seymour

- **Site:** 74/ Penhow Recreation Ground, Parc Seymour
- **New Site**

---

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Date Lodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C2</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

The proportion of housing to open space should seek to ensure the retention of local character and ecological value. This is especially the case for site 1341.C1 which includes a cSINC designation-it is recommended that the cSINC is retained as open space, and a buffer is created between development and the cSINC, as well as between development and the SSSI to the north.

- PROWs, TPOs and protected hedgerows should be enhanced throughout the sites.
- The provision of housing should include a convenience store on at least one of the sites.
- It is recommended that walking and cycling routes to key services and facilities including employment are enhanced as part of development proposals. Enhanced bus provision should also be considered to reduce the potential effect of traffic growth.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

Noted and agreed. This is considered a valuable area of environmental space. Such areas should be retained and allocated as environmental space in the LDP.

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Penhow Recreation Ground, Parc Seymour

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Market Road, Parc Seymour NP26 3AB

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 407 915

**Council Response:** 340724 191489

**Question:** 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** Not known.

**Council Response:** 1.42ha.

**Question:** 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** Children's Playground & Recreation Field.

**Question:** 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:** Children's Playground & Recreation Field.

**Question:** 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:** Children's Playground & Recreation Field.
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C2</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Penhow Recreation Ground, Parc Seymour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

- **Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

- **Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

- **Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

- **Representation Text:** Rural landscape overlooked by some houses. Present use non-intrusive. Any other use would be highly intrusive to the village as a whole, as it is the first area visible in Parc Seymour & visible from main road (A48).

- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: Strategically important Public Open Space

#### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Not protected.

- **Council Response:** Hedgerow trees TPO potential.

#### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

- **Representation Text:** Further development of this site would destroy the landscape and totally alter the appearance of the village.

#### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

- **Representation Text:** Yes. No river corridor, but certainly enhances green spaces and provides corridors for birds and other wildlife and plants along the A48 and outwards from Wentwood.

#### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

- **Representation Text:** No.

- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In medieval hunting park. No other archaeological features known. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

#### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

- **Representation Text:** Yes.

#### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

- **Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.4</th>
<th>Flood Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.5</th>
<th>Adjacent to Water Course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.6</th>
<th>Topography / Stability Problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.7</th>
<th>SSSI?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.8</th>
<th>Protected Species?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.9</th>
<th>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Listed building n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historic park n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conservation area n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Newport boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.1</th>
<th>Access to Highway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>no comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.10</th>
<th>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. This site is included within the assessment for Outdoor Play Provision and contributes to the local and wider needs for outdoor recreation. It contributes to the physical activity agenda which is increasingly gaining higher profile within the Welsh Assembly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.11</th>
<th>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.C2</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Retention of Penhow Recreation Ground, Parc Seymour

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
- **Representation Text:** Direct access to a bus stop from one of the two exits.
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
- **Representation Text:** Hourly.
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
- **Representation Text:** ~10 miles.
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
- **Representation Text:** ~1/4 - 1/2 mile. One shop.
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
- **Representation Text:** It is just as accessible as any of the other houses in the area - by bus or car. No local jobs.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- **Representation Text:** It is a recreation ground so encourages all forms of physical activity.
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** Public Right of Way runs to west of site down to the A48.

402/17 ONLY ALONG THE BOUNDARY, OUTSIDE THE SITE

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- **Representation Text:** It is the open space.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
Community Engagement?

*Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?*

**Representations Text:** Yes. At Community Council meetings, there is a desire to keep and protect this amenity.

---

Community Aspirations?

*Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?*

**Representations Text:** Maintenance of an extremely valuable and well used community resource.

---

Loss of Recreational Facilities?

*Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?*

**Representations Text:** No.

---

Infrastructure Proximity?

*Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?*

**Representations Text:** Electricity on site. Water access possible from adjoining houses. No sewerage, gas or phone.

---

Neighbouring Development Issues?

*Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?*

**Representations Text:** No.

---

Infrastructure Capacity?

*Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?*

**Representations Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

The green and open space allocations will have no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan.

---

Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

*Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?*

**Representations Text:** No.

---

Logical Extension?

*Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?*

**Representations Text:** Continuation of existing use.

---

Precedent Setting?

*Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?*

**Representations Text:** None.

---

Site Owned by Proposer?

*Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?*

**Representations Text:** No. Owned by Newport City Council.

---

Site Owner?

*Question: 7.2 Site Owner?*

**Representations Text:** No. Leased from NCC by Penhow Community Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.3</td>
<td>Interest in Adjoining Land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.4</td>
<td>Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.5</td>
<td>Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not relevant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.6</td>
<td>Development Boundary Change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.7</td>
<td>Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.8</td>
<td>Planning Application Refusals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.9</td>
<td>Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 8</td>
<td>Other Information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All we are trying to do here is try to ensure that the recreation ground is kept as it is. Potentially it could be the site of further housing development but that would be disastrous for the rest of the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 9</td>
<td>Map Included?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: 75/ Greenmeadow Drive Green Space, Parc Seymour</td>
<td>New Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Representation Texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td><strong>SA Recommendation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The proportion of housing to open space should seek to ensure the retention of local character and ecological value. This is especially the case for site 1341.C1 which includes a cSINC designation - it is recommended that the cSINC is retained as open space, and a buffer is created between development and the cSINC, as well as between development and the SSSI to the north.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ PROWs, TPOs and protected hedgerows should be enhanced throughout the sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ The provision of housing should include a convenience store on at least one of the sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ It is recommended that walking and cycling routes to key services and facilities including employment are enhanced as part of development proposals. Enhanced bus provision should also be considered to reduce the potential effect of traffic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question: | Overall Council Response |
| Council Response: | Noted and agreed. This is considered a valuable area of environmental space. Such areas should be retained and allocated as environmental space in the LDP. |

| Question: | Site Name |
| Representation Text: | Greenmeadow Drive Green Space |

| Question: | Location |
| Representation Text: | Greenmeadow Drive - adjacent to Nos 31, 33, 35, 37 and 69 NP26 3JR |

| Question: | Grid Reference |
| Representation Text: | ST 405 916 |
| Council Response: | 340579 191633 |

| Question: | Site Area |
| Representation Text: | Not known. |
| Council Response: | 0.12ha. |

| Question: | Brief Description |
| Representation Text: | Flat grassed area with seat and flower container and trees. |

| Question: | Current Use |
| Representation Text: | Open Space / Recreation |

<p>| Question: | Proposed Use(s) |
| Representation Text: | Open Space / Recreation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C3</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Green Space at Greenmeadow Drive, Parc Seymour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No. Probably was in agricultural use prior to current housing development (during 70s).

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** Pleasant, quiet area for rest and meeting friends. Visible from surrounding houses. Non-intrusive use.
- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: Strategically important Public Open Space

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Not protected.
- **Council Response:** TPO potential

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- **Representation Text:** Maintains the pleasant, open nature of the area.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Not inc. river corridors.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In medieval hunting park. No other archaeological features known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
### Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Retention of Green Space at Greenmeadow Drive, Parc Seymour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C3</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>SSSI?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Protected Species?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listed building n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>historic park n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conservation area n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Newport boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Access to Highway?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No traffic generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</td>
<td>Somewhere to rest on route to playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. This site does not currently contribute to the outdoor play provision across the City as verges and commons fall outside the definition of outdoor play as provided by Fields In Trust (formerly NPFA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Bus Route?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C3</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Green Space at Greenmeadow Drive, Parc Seymour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.3**  
**Bus Frequency?**  
**Representation Text:**  
It is on a bus route, near the bus stop.  
**Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.4**  
**Railway Station?**  
**Representation Text:**  
~10 miles.  
**Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.5**  
**Convenience Shop?**  
**Representation Text:**  
~ 1/2 mile. One shop.  
**Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.6**  
**Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**  
**Representation Text:**  
Not relevant.  
**Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.7**  
**Walking and Cycling?**  
**Representation Text:**  
Provides a resting place for elderly (in particular) residents walking around the village.  
**Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.8**  
**Public Rights of Way?**  
**Representation Text:**  
No.  
**Council Response:** No

**Question: 4.9**  
**Open Space?**  
**Representation Text:**  
It is the open space.  
**Council Response:** It is the open space.

**Question: 5.1**  
**Schools?**  
**Representation Text:**  
Yes. Children’s playground a few hundred metres away.  
**Council Response:** Yes

**Question: 5.2**  
**Community Engagement?**  
**Representation Text:**  
No.  
**Council Response:** No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

Representation Text: Maintenance of existing facility.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

representation Text: Not relevant.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

representation Text: No. No provision required.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

The green and open space allocations will have no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

representation Text: No. Belongs to Newport City Council.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**


**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

representation Text: No.
Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

Rep’n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
51.C3 01/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Green Space at Greenmeadow Drive, Parc Seymour

Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

Representation Text:
No.

Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

Representation Text:
No.

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?

Representation Text:
No.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

Representation Text:
No.

Question: 9 Map Included?

Representation Text:
Yes.

Rep’n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
51.C4 01/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Green Space at Rockfield Glade, Green, Parc Seymour

Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response: The proportion of housing to open space should seek to ensure the retention of local character and ecological value. This is especially the case for site 1341.C1 which includes a cSINC designation- it is recommended that the cSINC is retained as open space, and a buffer is created between development and the cSINC, as well as between development and the SSSI to the north.

- PROWs, TPOs and protected hedgerows should be enhanced throughout the sites.
- The provision of housing should include a convenience store on at least one of the sites.
- It is recommended that walking and cycling routes to key services and facilities including employment are enhanced as part of development proposals. Enhanced bus provision should also be considered to reduce the potential effect of traffic growth.

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: Noted and agreed. This is considered a valuable area of environmental space. Such areas should be retained and allocated as environmental space in the LDP.

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Rockfield Glade, Green

Issue:

Site: 76/ Rockfield Glade, Green, Parc Seymour

New Site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations &amp; Council Responses juxtaposed</th>
<th>Newport City Council Local Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by: Representation No</td>
<td>Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Green Space at Rockfield Glade, Green, Parc Seymour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.2 Location**

**Representation Text:** Rockfield Glade, Adjacent Nos 25 & 26, Parc Seymour, Penhow NP26 3JF

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

**Representation Text:** ST 409 916

**Council Response:** 340886 191553

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

**Representation Text:** Not known.

**Council Response:** 0.32ha.

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

**Representation Text:** Grassed area with some trees/shrubs. Slopes downwards NE - SW.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

**Representation Text:** Open Space / Recreation

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

**Representation Text:** Open Space / Recreation

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

**Representation Text:** No. Was part of a market garden up to late 70s, until the area was developed for housing use.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Representation Text:** Pleasant landscape. Non-intrusive use. Visible from surrounding housing.

**Council Response:** Countryside comments: Strategically important Public Open Space
### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Not protected.
- **Council Response:** TPO potential

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
- **Representation Text:** Retains an open space which provides an important resource for residents of the area.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Not inc. river corridors.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In medieval hunting park. No other archaeological features known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
- **Representation Text:** No.
### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.  No traffic generation.

**Council Response:**
no comment

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
Not relevant / no adjoining open spaces.

**Council Response:**
The Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. This site is included within the assessment for Outdoor Play Provision and contributes to the local and wider needs for outdoor recreation. It contributes to the physical activity agenda which is increasingly gaining higher profile within the Welsh Assembly Government.

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
It would not.

**Council Response:**
no comment

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:**
A few metres.

**Council Response:**
no comment

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:**
Hourly.

**Council Response:**
no comment

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:**
~10 miles.

**Council Response:**
no comment

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:**
~ 1/4 - 1/2 mile. One shop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C4</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Green Space at Rockfield Glade, Green, Parc Seymour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- **Representation Text:** No comment
- **Council Response:** Not relevant.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

- **Representation Text:** It retains an open area currently used for play activities.
- **Council Response:** No comment

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- **Representation Text:** It is the open space.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Children's playground and playing field less than 1/4 mile away.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

- **Representation Text:** Maintenance of existing facility secured for the future.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

- **Representation Text:** Not relevant.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

- **Representation Text:** No provision required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Green Space at Rockfield Glade, Green, Parc Seymour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

The green and open space allocations will have no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan.

---

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

Representation Text: No.

---

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

Representation Text: No. Owned by builders "Maxim". They have not been informed of this action - but it is continuation of current use.

---

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**


---

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

Representation Text: No.

---

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

Representation Text: No. Don't know.

---

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

Representation Text: Not relevant

---

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

Representation Text: No.

---

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

Representation Text: No.

---

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

Representation Text: No.

---

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

Representation Text: No.

---

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

Representation Text: Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retention of Green Space at Rockfield Glade, Green, Parc Seymour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53 C1
01/05/2009
P P W M

Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development at Bethesda Field, Rogerstone.

Site: 77/ Bethesda Field, Rogerstone
New Site

Question: SA Recommendation
Council Response:

Trees/Hedgerows on site should be retained where deemed beneficial for the enhancement or maintenance of biodiversity and green infrastructure. SINC Oaktree cottage fields, Monmouthshire B Canals (Crumlin Arm); Newport Environmental Space (Policy CE33); Cefn Council Wood (East & West) is a SINC. It should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted. The design of development should seek to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area. This could include the enhancement of the canal as a tourism attraction and the inclusion of tourist accommodation in the designations. This will also include the avoidance of any pollution to the watercourse. It is recommended that there is no loss to community facilities, notably the allotments under site 1232.C1 and 53.C1. This part of the site should be retained as allotments. The development of the settlement should seek to ensure that there is an appropriate range of local services and facilities within walking distance from residences, including health facilities. It should be ensured that the development of the sites incorporates walking and cycling routes to connect to the national cycle routes to connect to the national cycle network as well as to services and facilities including employment and education.

Question: Overall Council Response
Council Response:

Planning permission for residential development on the site (ref:11/0590) was refused during October 2011, in order to protect the open space as an amenity area. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations on greenfield sites cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council's strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council's strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

Question: 2.1 Site Name
Representation Text: Bethesda Field

Question: 2.2 Location
Representation Text: Bethesda Field, Cefn Road, Rogerstone

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
Representation Text: 327088 188635

Question: 2.4 Site Area
Representation Text: 1.5 approx

Question: 2.5 Brief Description
16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.C1</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Site for Residential Development at Bethesda Field, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

- **Question: 2.6 Current Use**
  - Representation Text: Grazing land for one horse.

- **Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
  - Representation Text: Residential.

- **Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
  - Representation Text: No.
  - Council Response: Note allotment allocation on part of the site.

- **Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
  - Representation Text: No.

- **Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
  - Representation Text: No.

- **Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
  - Representation Text: Boundary:
    - No 1 Unit factories
    - No 2 Residential
    - No 3 Main road
    - No 4 Woodland
  - Council Response: countryside comments:
    - Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and fringe Public Open Space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Public Open Space, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

- **Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
  - Representation Text: No.
  - Council Response: TPO'd woodland and trees with TPO potential.

- **Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
  - Representation Text: To be able to improve the woodland habitat at Cefn Woods.

- **Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development at Bethesda Field, Rogerstone.

**Question: 3.16** Archaeology?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2** Greenfield?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3** Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4** Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Cefn Wood (East + West) is a SINC.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development at Bethesda Field, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Council Response:**
Yes Cefn Rd. Cefn Rd has capacity. T.A. to confirm.
Access could be problematic due to visibility + level difference etc.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
Providing a footpath to the woods from the area of Rogerstone.

**Council Response:**
The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. There is no play space in the immediate area, the nearest site being 1.2Km with the local highway infrastructure not having any controlled crossing points on route. Therefore a LEAP provision would be requested on-site to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
Footpaths from industrial area to main road and bus stops.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
On boundary No 3.

**Council Response:**
Cefn Rd
bus stops <100m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
15 minutes.

**Council Response:**
20-30 mins freq

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
0.5 mile

**Council Response:**
Rogerstone 1.9km
Newport 4.5km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
0.25 mile 6 shops

**Council Response:**
Pub Tredegar Arms, adjacent on Cefn Rd.
St Johns Crescent 600m
High Cross Garage
Tesco Cefn Rd 300m
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation &amp; Council Responses juxtaposed</th>
<th>Newport City Council Local Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage=C; not submitted Late</strong></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development at Bethesda Field, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:** Within the local area.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:** Being close to all amenities.

**Council Response:** Cefn Road has good footway. Way access + NCN 47 canal.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:** 200m

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Cefn Wood School, Mount Pleasant School, High Cross School, TyDu Welfare Ground and Hall

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Full Council

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:** By bringing more trade to the local business.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Western part of site is allocated as allotments in the UDP.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:** At boundary.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

16/02/2012
**Representation Text:** Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**

To square off the residential development to this area.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

None.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**

No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential Development at Bethesda Field, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- Representation Text: 1-3

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- Representation Text: Yes. Allotments and Environmental Space on UDP (NCC correction).

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- Representation Text: No.
  - Council Response: Relevant History on adjacent site: ERECTION OF 17 DETACHED DWELLINGS – 97/0795 - GRANTED

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
- Representation Text: Yes.
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**65**

**Redrow Homes (S Wales) Ltd**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site: 27/ Llanwern, West of Langstone Lane  New Site**

**Question**

**Representation Texts**

**Question: SA Recommendation**

**Council Response:**

- Similar allocation site to site 23 (250.C1).
- SINC designation- any potentially negative effects on habitats or species should be investigated and mitigated prior to development on site.
- Part C2 designation: it is recommended that development does not occur within the flood plain, and that SUDS are implemented throughout the site to ensure that there is no increase in net surface water runoff. Avoiding the flood plain will also help to ensure that water quality is maintained.
- The areas classified as high quality agricultural land should not be developed if possible. Further, the retention of the woodland is recommended.
- It is recommended that the sites provides a mix of uses to include a full range of community facilities such as those included within Table 3.4 to reduce the need to travel and reduce potential inequalities.
- There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument within the site - a Bronze Age round barrow (Mm 170) - near Underwood; and another - a motte (Mn59) - close to the site at Langstone Court Farm. ASA borders the southern limits of Llanwern Park. It should be ensured that the development of the site does not negatively affect the setting or integrity of archaeological features. Where possible these should be enhanced. The mix of uses could include tourist facilities to maximise the tourism potential of the area.
- Public transport improvements should be required as part of development on the site.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

**Council Response:**

Not proposed for inclusion. In addition to the various constraints, there is a substantial amount of land, both greenfield and brownfield, available in the vicinity

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

**Representation Text:** Langstone Lane (West of), Llanwern

**Question: 2.2 Location**

**Representation Text:** West of Langstone Lane, north of Hazel Farm, Llanwern Village, NP18 2DS

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

**Representation Text:** ST 367 886

**Council Response:** 336817 188869

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

**Representation Text:** 0.8ha (2 acres)

**Council Response:** 1.43ha.

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

**Representation Text:** The site is flat but has some tree cover. The site bounds Langstone Lane on its eastern boundary giving good access. Overhead power lines cross the site.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Site for residential and associated uses on land east of Langstone Lane, Llanwern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text:** Paddock / garden

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text:** Residential and associated uses.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No. No

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No. No – paddock / garden only.
- **Council Response:** Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. There is a low probability of BMV at this site. The soils are poor (Denchworth).

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** The site is located adjacent to the Gallagher development proposals. In relation to the development of this large site, the development of the subject site would have little or no adverse impact. The local environment would change substantially, so that the additional land would have minor additional impact.
- **Council Response:** Countryside Comments: Incursion into open countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Yes – the trees on site are subject to a blanket TPO. Many trees are not worthy of protection and subject to the proper assessments and agreement with Newports Tree Officer, some trees could be felled and others made safe. The important and healthy trees would be retained.
- **Council Response:** Site includes mixed deciduous woodland. TPO potential

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- **Representation Text:** The trees on site are in need of management. The scheme would afford immediate works to improve the health of the retained trees and ensure their long term strength through a management plan.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Yes – the area with protected trees would be given over as POS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.16 Archaeology?</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>No. No evidence of such</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment - None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.2 Greenfield?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.4 Flood Risk?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No. No the land is elevated above local streams. No risk from coastal flooding exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No. No the land is elevated above local streams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.7 SSSI?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No. Trees are subject to TPO. Possible challenge by landowner to designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.8 Protected Species?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No. None known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td>Listed building n/a Ancient monuments n/a historic park n/a conservation area n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Newport boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access to Highway?

Representation Text: No. The site is accessible from the local highway – Langstone Lane. It is fair to say that Langstone Lane is not suitable for supporting any additional traffic growth. The development of the site would need to be brought forward in association with the adjoining land being promoted by Gallaghers.

Council Response: yes
no. narrow lanes not suitable for additional traffic. Visibility splays do not appear achievable.

Open Space Linkage Improvement?

Representation Text: The Llanwern Ward has a shortfall in play space of 1.52Ha. There is no play space in the immediate area of the site therefore a LEAP provision would be requested on-site to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development. This will be required even though this site is adjacent to the proposed Llanwern Village Development which will be providing a range of outdoor facilities.

Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

Representation Text: New footpath links to bus stops can be provided.
Increased patronage can be provided.

Bus Route?

Representation Text: Bus stops are located in Llanwern Village with further services anticipated as part of the EEA development.

Council Response: Southern land adjacent bus route. Northern land 1.1km

Bus Frequency?

Representation Text: Bus routes provide services to Newport.

Council Response: 1-2 hour frequency

Railway Station?

Representation Text: At Newport. Potential for new station as part of the EEA proposals?

Council Response: newport station

Convenience Shop?

Representation Text: Few facilities exist within the village of Llanwern at present – but the EEA proposals will bring all necessary new facilities to support the existing homes, the Gallagher proposals and any addition to the EEA. Currently the nearest facilities are in Newport.

Council Response: Ringland district centre 1.3km & 2.3km Always district centre 2.4km & 3.4km
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**Question: 4.6** Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:** Few employment facilities exist within the village of Llanwern at present – but the EEA proposals will bring all necessary new opportunities. Currently the nearest facilities are in Newport.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.7** Walking and Cycling?

**Representation Text:** The land would provide a link from the Gallaghers proposal to Langstone Lane and back to Langstone Village.

**Question: 4.8** Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:** No. No

**Question: 4.9** Open Space?

**Representation Text:** Play facilities and a golf course exist in the southern part of Llanwern Village. New facilities are promised with the Gallaghers development.

**Question: 5.1** Schools?

**Representation Text:** No. A new school is proposed as part of the EEA. Additional development in the area would increase the use of the new school.

**Question: 5.2** Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:** No. No – it has been difficult to engage with the local community and Newport Council to discuss the area of land. Redrow is happy to hold such discussions.

**Question: 5.3** Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:** To be determined following discussions with community / council.

**Question: 5.4** Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:** No. No – nothing will be lost. Additional facilities, improved access to such and increased patronage would arise.

**Question: 6.1** Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:** Site can be easily infrastructured in association with the EEA. By having more than one developer in the area, there is less risk that the development would not have the financial resources to come forward.

**Question: 6.2** Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:** No. No – no un-neighbourly problems will arise. Construction and subsequent residential traffic will be managed appropriately.
Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representative Text:
Yes.  No – the whole area will be subject to significant investment in new infrastructure.
By having more than one developer in the area, there is less risk that the development would not have the financial resources to come forward.

Council Response:
Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelwork’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

Sewerage Treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate
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Summary: Candidate Site for residential and associated uses on land east of Langstone Lane, Llanwern.

 methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**

No. No un-neighbourly uses exist in the vicinity of the proposal to prevent residential development on the site.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**

The land forms part of the EEA. The Gallaghers development is significant and will bring a logic to allowing the subject land to come forward. Additional land as part of Hazel Farm would also have merit in becoming a new and additional allocation in the EEA. Both the subject land and land at Hazel farm are shown on Plan 2.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

The land is within the EEA as determined in the UDP. This extensive red line area provided for an immediate new settlement and for any future additions to the proposal. The gradual but planned expansion of Llanwern new settlement is included for in the development plan.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**

No. The landowner has been notified on this submission. Redrow holds an option over the site.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**

No. The landowner has been notified on this submission. Redrow holds an option over the site.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**

No. No – the land proposed is all Redrow that have an interest in. Redrow has been discussing the merits of joint promotion with the owners of Hazel farm. There is merit between that land and the Redrow site coming forward together.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**

No. No – there are no legal constraints that will affect the delivery of the site.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. It is estimated that the land could come forward within the 4 – 6 year timescale.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
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<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential and associated uses on land east of Langstone Lane, Llanwern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

If the same procedure as the UDP is to be adopted then revisions to the SPG would be required. Alternatively and preferably the land should be more specifically shown within the emerging LDP.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Relevant History on adjacent site:

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (UP TO 1100 DWELLINGS) AND PROVISION OF PRIMARY SCHOOL, VILLAGE CENTRE, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS (AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY 397/3, 397/7, 397/9, 397/10 - LLANWERN) 06/0845 - GRANTED AND 06/0846

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

- **Representation Text:** The land was promoted at the UDP but due to the methods of considering the EEA very little consideration of the site was taken. The whole exercise was taken over by a collaboration between Gallaghers and NCC.

  It is requested that in this plan round other parcels of land are considered for formal inclusion in the development area and brought forward as additional allocations.

  Newport should consider the merits of including additional land outside the additional promoters area. The considerable funding required to bring forward a start on the Llanwern site is more likely if more than one developer is involved. The market at present has presented considerable difficulties to developers and house builders and as a result significant delays will arise to large schemes and / or those with significant upfront land and infrastructure costs. The lighter the burden on any single developer, the earlier the likelihood that the development will commence.

  Redrow is happy to meet with Newport Council to discuss the site further and determine what additional information is required to assist in the consideration of this site.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. See attached Red line site plan and plan showing site in relation to the Gallaghers site and adjacent Hazel Farm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential and associated development on 10 hectares at Pentrepoeth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 83/ Pentrepoeth (Redrow) New Site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
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<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential and associated development on 10 hectares at Pentrepoeth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: SA Recommendation**

May affect a SINC designated site: potential effects should be investigated and mitigated prior to development on site.

Public rights of way as well as additional walking and cycling routes (including safe routes to school) should be developed through the design process.

Development should be located away from the watercourse as part of the river walkway scheme to reduce potential pollution to water resources.

It is recommended that local convenience stores are provided as part of the mix of uses to reduce the need to travel.

**Council Response:**

There is an extensive planning history associated with this site. As the above sets out, a number of planning applications seeking the development of the site for residential development have been refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal. The most recent of which is planning application 04/0397. The site was also considered at the Unitary Development Plan Inquiry for inclusion in the plan as a residential allocation. In considering the representations the Inspector noted “the site is clearly part of the countryside on the outskirts of Pentrepoeth and for it to be developed as proposed it would be necessary to demonstrate a need for housing that outweighed the broad thrust of policies seeking to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the countryside” (para 3.80).

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in the countryside cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The site is also identified as an area of high value in the LANDMAP assessment that formed the basis of the designated Special Landscape Areas – West of Rhiwderin, which the candidate site forms part of.

It is therefore recommended that the candidate site is not allocated for residential use in the Local Development Plan.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

There is an extensive planning history associated with this site. As the above sets out, a number of planning applications seeking the development of the site for residential development have been refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal. The most recent of which is planning application 04/0397. The site was also considered at the Unitary Development Plan Inquiry for inclusion in the plan as a residential allocation. In considering the representations the Inspector noted “the site is clearly part of the countryside on the outskirts of Pentrepoeth and for it to be developed as proposed it would be necessary to demonstrate a need for housing that outweighed the broad thrust of policies seeking to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the countryside” (para 3.80).

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in the countryside cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The site is also identified as an area of high value in the LANDMAP assessment that formed the basis of the designated Special Landscape Areas – West of Rhiwderin, which the candidate site forms part of.

It is therefore recommended that the candidate site is not allocated for residential use in the Local Development Plan.

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

Representation Text: Pentrepoeth (Redrow)

**Question: 2.2 Location**

Representation Text: Pentrepoeth, north of Penylan Road, south of Pentrepoeth Road, west of Cowshed Lane, Pentrepoeth, Bassaleg

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

Representation Text: ST 270 867

Council Response: 327077 186589

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential and associated development on 10 hectares at Pentrepoeth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description
**Representation Text:**
- The site slopes gently towards the stream which flows through it. Presently comprises overgrown nurseries, pasture and stands of trees. Trees, hedges, walls and fencing bound the site and the enclosures within it. The site occupies a semi-rural setting on the outskirts of the wider built up area of Bassaleg with good access to nearby commercial and employment centres.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use
**Representation Text:**
- Agriculture - pony paddocks

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
**Representation Text:**
- Residential and associated uses - in the region of 175 units.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
**Representation Text:**
- No. Part of the land used to be a nursery (now derelict). The remainder is agricultural - pony paddocks.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
**Representation Text:**
- No

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
**Representation Text:**
- No. Paddocked for horses. Part of the site derelict – previously a nursery. Agricultural Land Quality is good.
**Council Response:**
Welsh Government comment: High Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. Previously surveyed (post revision - 002/91) - Grades 2 and 3b. Salwick soils, maximum grade 2 on climate. There is a high probability of BMV at this site.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
**Representation Text:**
- The site benefits from a local landform with an inward facing nature meaning that any development would not be widely visible from the open countryside.
**Council Response:**
Countryside Comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Area within proposed SLA 2 West of Rhiwderin. Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
**Representation Text:**
- Yes – hedges and trees exist on site. Not known if these are currently protected – not protected when last promoted. Hedges and trees will in the main be protected and enhanced as part of the development.
**Council Response:**
Various protected trees on site.
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<td>65.C2</td>
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**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
Representation Text: See previous reports submitted with UDP promotion. Inspector agreed the site was suitable for development.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
Representation Text: Yes. Yes – see comments above

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
Representation Text: No. Potential for an old Roman Road through the site – early studies are not conclusive in this. Nevertheless a development scheme will avoid this potential route and keep it undisturbed in situ.
Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Crossed by line of Roman Road. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
Representation Text: Yes. Part of the land used to be a nursery (now derelict). The remainder is agricultural – pony paddocks.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
Representation Text: No. None

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
Representation Text: No. No development is planned immediately adjacent to the stream at bottom of valley. This will become a river walkway.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
Representation Text: Yes. Yes – a stream runs through the site with the topography sloping gently towards the stream on both sides. No development is planned immediately adjacent to the stream at bottom of valley. This will become a river walkway.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
Representation Text: No. No

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
Representation Text: No. No the site has no landscape or nature conservation designations attached. There are no features of nature conservation value but those features present on site that could be of interest such as stream corridors and copses and most hedgerows will be retained and enhanced within the development scheme.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.C2</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for residential and associated development on 10 hectares at Pentrepoeth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.9</th>
<th>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Listed building n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historic park n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conservation area n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.1</th>
<th>Access to Highway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. The site is accessible from the local highway. The site is capable of supporting 175 units as proved at the UDP inquiry. The Inspector concluded that 'On the evidence available to me it appears that there are no insurmountable barriers to the provision of a safe access and adequate infrastructure to serve the site or of making any necessary improvements to the local road infrastructure'. The site will need to be supported by junction improvements and traffic management around the rear school entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No- Pentrepoeth Rd- substantial width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No footways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penylan Rd- ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not suitable location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor junction onto A468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.10</th>
<th>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Additional complementary provision can be provided along with the new proposed stream walkway. Community Council have expressed a wish to secure additional land from any scheme to provide more burial ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population. The existing community facilities would be inadequate to sustain the size of development area proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.11</th>
<th>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>There is already good existing public transport provision. New footpath links to bus stops can be provided. Increased patronage can be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.2</th>
<th>Bus Route?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Bus stops are located within 400m of the majority of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Caerphilly rd @100m edge of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:** Bus routes provide services along Caerphilly Road and Forge Lane and provide services to Caerphilly, Newport, Cardiff and the Valleys. Services are frequent and cater for commuters.

**Council Response:** 30 mins

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:**

**Council Response:** Rogerstone.

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:** A local store is located in the village. Supermarkets are located in Rogerstone and Dyffryn.

**Council Response:** Laurel rd shops + P.o -550m edge of site

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:** Most existing and new employment opportunities in Newport are to the west of the city. These are within easy accessibility of the site. Many community services are easily available – Bassaleg Comprehensive, Pentrepoeth Primary School, local pubs and restaurants, shops, childrens play area, playing field, community centre, allotments, church and cemetery.

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

**Representation Text:** Yes –within easy walking / cycling distances of local facilities and employment opportunities. New routes can be created / formalised through the development.

**Council Response:** No footways on pentpoeth and Penylan, Development would not encourage multimodel accessibility.

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Yes several footpaths cross the site and link to the site. These are shown on the attached plan. Some informal routes created by school children exist and can be formalised and made safe. A Safe Route to School can be created.

**Council Response:** 393/113 & 114

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?

**Representation Text:** Adjacent – play area and playing field available. Allotment gardens also available.

### Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:** Bassaleg Comprehensive School is adjacent. Pentrepoeth Primary is located within the village. Both are convenient to the site.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:**

---

**Summary:** Candidate Site for residential and associated development on 10 hectares at Pentrepoeth.
Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.C2</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for residential and associated development on 10 hectares at Pentrepoeth.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Yes – during previous promotions. Previously land was to be transferred to the local Community Council for an addition to the existing burial ground and money transferred for the existing POS. Such benefits and / or others can and will be discussed further.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**

No. No – nothing will be lost.

**Additional facilities, improved access to such and increased patronage would arise.**

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Site can be easily infrastructured. All services are available.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:**

No. No – no un-neighbourly problems will arise. Construction and subsequent residential traffic will be managed appropriately.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Previous investigations indicate that site can be easily serviced. No known infrastructure constraint exists.

**Council Response:**

**Welsh Water Comments**

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential and associated development on 10 hectares at Pentrepoeth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**
No. No un-neighbourly uses exist in the vicinity of the proposal to prevent residential development on the site.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**
The Inspector to the UDP determined that the site was suitable and desirable and deliverable for development but only did not allocate it because it was not determined not to be needed to meet the land supply of that plan.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**
The site is free standing and does not rely on any other site to come forward first. The site can come forward in its entirety or in part. Redrow is aware that sites to the south and the west of this land are being promoted by other parties. These sites that would depend on this site coming forward first or in association with it. The Redrow land is not dependent on these.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The land is in three ownerships and all have been notified on this submission. Redrow holds options over the site.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**
No. The land is in three ownerships and all have been notified on this submission. Redrow holds options over the site.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**
No. No – the land proposed is all Redrow that have an interest in.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**
No. No – there are no legal constraints that will affect the delivery of the site.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The land is immediately available – subject to the necessary planning permission being secured. The site will provide much needed family housing and contribute to the immediate 5-year land supply. The site can be started in the 1 – 3 year band.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The settlement boundary would need to be changed. No other designation change is necessary – the Green Wedge was amended by the Inspector following the UDP Inquiry.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Poly</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.C2</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential and associated development on 10 hectares at Pentrepoeth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**

- DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING LOCAL CENTRE AND PRIMARY SCHOOL INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS
  - 93/0206 25/02/1994 REFUSED
- ERECTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING WITH GARAGE - RESUBMISSION FOLLOWING REFUSAL OF APPLICATION 90/0609/F
  - 90/0862 7/09/1990 REFUSED
- COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF 66 HECTARES (163 ACRES) OF LAND TO COMPRISE HOUSING RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS (OUTLINE) - DUPLICATE APPLICATION
  - 90/0992 09/11/1990 REFUSED
- COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF 66 HECTARES (163 ACRES) OF LAND TO COMPRISE HOUSING RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS (OUTLINE)
  - 90/0910 14/05/1992 DISMISSED UPON APPEAL
- DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING HOUSING AND RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS - DUPLICATE APPLICATION
  - 90/0428 09/11/1990 Refused
- ERECTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING FOLLOWING PREVIOUS REFUSAL
  - 91/0020 22/02/1991 REFUSAL

**Council Response:**

- Relevant History on adjacent sites:
  - CONSTRUCTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS 93/0207 – REFUSED
  - ERECTION OF 11 NO. RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS – 97/0103 – GRANTED
  - DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES (OUTLINE) 90/1069 - REFUSED
  - HOUSING AND ASSOCIATED USES INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS
    - 94/0521 06/01/1997 Dismissed upon appeal

**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE)**

- 04/0397 01/09/2004 DISMISSED UPON APPEAL
- EDUCATION-HEAD OF POLICY AND RESOURCES: Site falls within catchment of Pentrepoeth Primary and Bassaleg Secondary Schools. Both schools are over capacity and would be unable to accommodate the additional pupils this development would generate.
Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
Representation Text: Yes. Yes – application reference 04/0397 (date 08/03/04) and appeal reference APP/G6935/A/04/1149900. The decision notice was issued 1st September 2004. Appeal was dismissed essentially on highway grounds. It was felt that the highway evidence this written reps appeal had been misunderstood by the Inspector – who appeared to conclude that the school entrance was the main school entrance. These grounds for refusal were however not supported by the UDP Inspectors – who received evidence and wrote his recommendations after the appeal result, with full knowledge of the appeal decision.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: No. No

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text: The land was promoted by Redrow in the Newport UDP and was found by the Inspector to be suitable and deliverable for housing purposes but that it was not needed due to the land supply proposed by the Council within that plan – that is the City Centre schemes and the EEA. The Council has had significant success with the town centre redevelopment schemes but the EEA has failed to come forward in association with the timetable put forward by the Council at the Inquiry. The delay is much more like the objectors at that time predicted.

At the previous inquiry detailed evidence in relation to the planning merits, highway and transportation and landscape quality was submitted. This information can be re-submitted should the Council wish.

The proposed site is immediately available for residential development. The site is technically deliverable and free from legal constraints. The previous Inspector stated that in planning terms it is a desirable site. The land can deliver much needed family homes to Newport which has in the main only delivered flat and apartment schemes in recent years. The land would be able to deliver affordable housing (in the immediate future) to assist the housing department in meeting the AHDP. The site is sustainably located and can deliver benefits required by the local community council (the burial land) and Redrow can make similar inquiries as to the benefits that can be afforded to the local comprehensive school.

Redrow is happy to meet with Newport Council to discuss the site further and determine what additional information is required to assist in the consideration of this site.

Question: 9 Map Included?
Representation Text: Yes. See attached – site plan with footpaths marked.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

### 76 Coleg Gwent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agent:** RPS Group PLC

**Site:** 38/ Nash College  
**New Site**

**Representation Texts**

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

- In order to determine the best use for the site, the local need to educational facilities vs. employment and leisure facilities should be investigated. Whichever proposal is likely to enable the reduction in inequalities in the context of other sites being carried forward should be pursued. Either option is likely to improve employment opportunities in the area.
- Green space should be enhanced as part of proposals. This should incorporate SUDS as part of a flood risk reduction strategy.
- Any development on site should seek to avoid effect to the watercourse.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

As the intentions with regard to the potential relocation of the college are not clear, it would be inappropriate to allocate it for other uses. As a brownfield site within the urban area, however, redevelopment for other uses for the site could be considered if it should become surplus to requirements.

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** City of Newport Campus (Coleg Gwent), Newport

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Land at Nash Road, Newport

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**

**Council Response:** 334111 186528

**Question:** 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** 5.6ha approx.

**Council Response:** 5.37ha.

**Question:** 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** Further education campus.

**Question:** 2.6 Proposed Use(s)

---

16/02/2012
### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
**Representation Text:**
Yes. Further education campus.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
**Representation Text:**
Site lies within the urban area of Newport surrounded on all sides by built development including Newport Retail Park, residential development, Lliswerry High School, Spytty Park Leisure Centre and industrial business uses.

**Council Response:**
Countryside comments:
- No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans for future development will require input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
TPO potential

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
**Representation Text:**
To be confirmed and controlled at planning application stage.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
**Representation Text:**
No. Site comprises a brownfield site with an existing use as further education campus.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Site is within the Gwent Levels Archaeologically Sensitive Area.
  
  On Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area
  Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

---

16/02/2012
## Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for continued use, or reuse, of Nash College.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 3.3** Contaminated Land Risk?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.4** Flood Risk?
- Representation Text: Yes. Zone C1 of TAN15 "served by significant infrastructure including flood defences" within which TAN15 confirms "development can take place subject to application of justification test including acceptability of consequences".

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?
- Representation Text: Yes.
- Council Response: yes
- yes transport assessment required

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?
- Representation Text: Site is accessible to open space and leisure facilities.
Summary: Candidate Site for continued use, or reuse, of Nash College.

Part of this site is included within the assessment for Outdoor Play Provision and contributes to the local and wider needs for outdoor recreation, as Newport has a shortfall of outdoor recreational space of 10.46Ha. It contributes to the physical activity agenda which is increasingly gaining higher profile within the Welsh Assembly Government and the retention of this space for recreation purposes will be necessary to maintain the existing levels of outdoor play space.

The Sports Council for Wales (SCW) provides advice on all aspects of planning for sport and recreation including those considered in LDPs, and is a statutory consultee which must be consulted about planning applications affecting playing fields, currently where a playing pitch of at least 0.4 hectares is included. In due course this threshold is to be reduced to sites including a playing pitch of 0.2 hectares.

Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

Representation Text: Site is accessible to public transport links.

Council Response: Site is accessible to public transport links.

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

Representation Text: Adjacent on Nash Road.

Council Response: Adjacent site

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

Representation Text: Main bus route.

Council Response: Very good 20 minute service

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

Representation Text: Approx 2 miles.

Council Response: Newport station 5km

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

Representation Text: Newport Retail Park within 400m of site and local shops on Nash Road.

Council Response: Shop on Nash road 100 metres

Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

Representation Text: Range of employment and leisure facilities to south, east and west of site.

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

Representation Text: Site is accessible to cyclepath and footpath links.

Council Response: On site provision and infrastructure linking onto SDR cycle route.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E PW E ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.8** Public Rights of Way?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 4.9** Open Space?
- Representation Text: School playing fields adjacent.

**Question: 5.1** Schools?
- Representation Text: Yes. Lliswerry High School located to south of site.

**Question: 5.2** Community Engagement?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 5.3** Community Aspirations?
- Representation Text: To be considered pursuant to LDP and planning application consultation process.

**Question: 5.4** Loss of Recreational Facilities?
- Representation Text: No. No public facilities to be lost.

**Question: 6.1** Infrastructure Proximity?
- Representation Text: Existing services exist.

**Question: 6.2** Neighbouring Development Issues?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.3** Infrastructure Capacity?
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Summary: Candidate Site for continued use, or reuse, of Nash College.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. Any upgrade of this asset will likely be considerably expensive. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: Yes. Mix and disposition of uses to be confirmed and controlled at planning application stage.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: Site lies within urban area with an existing use and would not "extend" settlement.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text: N/A

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?

Representation Text: Yes. 4 - 6 years.

Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING LIBRARY BUILDING AND MAIN ENTRANCE AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW LEARNING RESOURCE CENTRE, CLASSROOMS AND EXAM HALL
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for continued use, or reuse, of Nash College.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLITION OF EXISTING LIBRARY AND MAIN ENTRANCE AND ERECTION OF NEW LEARNING RESOURCE CENTRE AND ASSOCIATED TEACHING FACILITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMISSION 02/0478)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/1406 20/12/2002 GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF FOOD STORE WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND ACCESS ROAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98/0064 25/02/1998 GRANTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION IN BASEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERECTION OF 8 NO. 5-A-SIDE AND 1 NO. 7-A-SIDE FOOTBALL PITCHES TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED CHANGING ROOMS AND CAFÉ/BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/0977 11-Sep-2008 GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES; RENEWAL OF DEEMED PLANNING CONSENT 1/15001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/0011 09-Feb-1990 OBJECTIONS - TREES IN CONSERVATION AREA (DETAILS IN BASEMENT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERECTION OF FOOD STORE WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND ACCESS ROAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/0899 08-Dec-1997 WITHDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE ERECTION OF A CAR SHOWROOM WITH ANCILLARY OFFICE WORKSHOP MOT BAYS EXPRESS FIT AND STORAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:** Coleg Gwent have recently adopted an estates strategy with the objective of rationalising its facilities throughout Newport, Monmouthshire, Caerphilly, Torfaen and Blaenau Gwent. The campus site at Newport is a key component of the adopted estates strategy and an option being considered is a possible relocation from Nash Road to the city centre. It is essential, therefore, that the LDP provides for both the continued operation and rationalisation of the site for its current use, and also for any potential re-development of the site should it become surplus to the requirements of the college within the plan period. In this context, the site is promoted for a specific allocation within the LDP which allows for the future operation or re-development of the campus. The attached plan confirms the boundary of the site.
The site comprises approximately 5.6 ha (13.88 acres) and benefits from good strategic and local vehicular access to Nash Road. It lies in an area characterised by a mix and range of land uses with Newport Retail Park to the north-east, residential development to the north and west, Lliswerry High School to the south, Spytty Park Leisure Centre to the south-west, and industrial / business uses in the wider area.

The site is allocated for education uses within the adopted Unitary Development Plan and a similar designation within the LDP is considered appropriate provided that reference is made to the potential availability of the site for re-development within the plan period. The character of the area suggests that a mixed-use re-development scheme including residential, office, business, and leisure uses would be appropriate although it is recognised that the detailed mix and disposition of uses would need to be confirmed at the planning application stage.
## Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

### 132 Oak Court Estates (Langstone Mon) Ltd

**Agent:** Harmers Limited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for mixed use development for residential, employment and commercial purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: SA Recommendation

- Mixed use scheme on one portion of site- mix of uses should include a new village centre to include convenience shopping, health centre, post office, and educational facilities. Further investment in well off areas may increase inequalities across the plan area: It should be ensured that the benefits of the scheme are realised for the entire community through sustainable accessibility provision. It is recommended that the site be developed to link and promote accessibility by walking and cycling, including connection to wider routes, connecting the area to the city.
- Development would lead to an increase in traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution. Potential noise pollution from A48 adjacent to site: these effects should be mitigated as part of any development which may include the use of vegetative buffers.
- Although not in a high flood risk zone, it is recommended that the development include SUDS to ensure that there is no net increase in surface water runoff, to reduce the risk of an increase in flooding.

### Council Response: Overall Council Response

- No change. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

  The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

  It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development purposes.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

- Representation Text: Oak Court, Langstone, Newport

### Question: 2.2 Location

- Representation Text: Land between Catsash Road, The A48 and Halse Garden Centre

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

- Representation Text: ST 378 905
- **Council Response:** 337630 190323

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

16/02/2012
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for mixed use development for residential, employment and commercial purposes.

**Representation Text:**

- 24 hectares

**Council Response:**

- 26.22ha.

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

**Representation Text:**

- Most of the land comprises pasture and rises from the A48 northwards with a shoulder of higher land to the west.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

**Representation Text:**

- Grazing

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

**Representation Text:**

- Mixed use - residential / employment / commercial

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. A mixture of 3a, 3b and 4 agriculture land.

**Council Response:**

- Welsh Government comment: There is a low to moderate probability of there being BMV at this site. Likely grades are a mosaic of 3a and 3b due to favourable climate but high FCD's. Much of the site will not be BMV due to slope. This is further supported by a pre revision survey that found the area to be a mix of subgrades 3a and 3b.

- Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Representation Text:**

- A landscape and visual assessment has been undertaken. The site lies within a landscape with a wide variety of components and the overall value of the area around Langstone is low. The majority of views are from local vantage points within the site and close to the site (within 1km).

**Council Response:**

- Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of Moderate to High value in LANDMAP. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

**Representation Text:**

- No. No protected tree on the site but mature trees and hedgerows will be maintained within the development.

**Council Response:**

- TPOs - woodland - 14/97 - mixed woodland comprising holly, hazel hawthorn, sycamore, birch, hornbeam, beech, ash and narrow leaved ash. TPO 72 Mon and 14/1997 plus additional TPO potential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.14</th>
<th>Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>An ecological assessment has been undertaken and areas of nature conservation value including water courses, hedgerows and mature trees will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.15</th>
<th>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. The master plan will ensure the provision of green spaces / amenity areas and footpath links within the site and to adjacent land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.16</th>
<th>Archaeology?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No. An archaeological Desk Top Study has been undertaken which has confirmed that site is not affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Pre-19th century field boundaries Restraint. Archaeological assessment produced. Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. No reason for not allocating in LDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.2</th>
<th>Greenfield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.3</th>
<th>Contaminated Land Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.4</th>
<th>Flood Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.5</th>
<th>Adjacent to Water Course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.6</th>
<th>Topography / Stability Problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.7</th>
<th>SSSI?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.8</th>
<th>Protected Species?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.9</th>
<th>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary
Candidate Site for mixed use development for residential, employment and commercial purposes.

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Transport Assessment undertaken.

**Council Response:**
Yes- the council has a policy against new access onto Chepstow road in the interest of highway safety and capacity. This had been the subject of a refused application 98/0192. Roundabout access on Chepstow road must be acceptable full transport assessment will be required.

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
By providing footpath and cycle links to open space.

**Council Response:**
The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. The size of this development would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application are submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population. The existing community facilities would be inadequate to sustain the size of development area proposed.

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
By providing housing immediately adjacent to a major public transport link.

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:**
Adjacent to site on A48.

**Council Response:**
adjacent site

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:**
25 minutes (3 routes)

**Council Response:**
good 20-30 min service

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:**
8km (5 miles).

**Council Response:**
newport station 5 miles

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

16/02/2012
### Rep'n/Para/Policy  | AccessnNo  | DateLodgd  | Lat? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified | Summary
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
132.C1 | | 05/05/2009 | | | | | | | Candidate Site for mixed use development for residential, employment and commercial purposes.

**Representation Text:**
- 3 km (2 miles) to Ringland Centre: 5 shops.
- garage shop-opposite side of chepstow road
- chepstow road 2.7km
- (royal oak)
- underwood 3km

**Council Response:**
- Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
  - Very accessible to local primary school and Langstone Business Park within walking and cycling distance.

- Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
  - Layout would be designed to encourage walking and cycling.

- Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
  - Yes.
  - Footpaths 394/11, 394/12 and 394/14. 394/11, 12, 14, 28

- Question: 4.9 Open Space?
  - Adjacent of site.
  - Langstone Recreation Ground
  - The Nurseries northern site
  - The Nurseries southern site.

- Question: 5.1 Schools?
  - Yes. Primary school adjoins site but no other community facilities in the immediate area.

- Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
  - Yes. Discussions have been held with community councillor who recommends the scheme.

- Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
  - By the provision of additional commercial facilities and employment within the site.

- Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
  - No.
**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:** Services are adjacent site in A48.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Developer has agreed with Welsh Water to reinforce water supply and sewerage facilities with the improvements benefiting Langstone as a whole.

**Welsh Water Comments**

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site useage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.
| Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo Date Lodged Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary |
|--------------------------------|--------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 132.C1                        | 05/05/2009 | P W M   |           |           |                 |                 |

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**
- Representation Text: Yes. B1 employment use proposed on site - distances will be determined in detailed layout.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**
- Representation Text: The proposal would represent a logical extension of Langstone, north of the A48 linking the two concentrations of housing in Langstone north of the A48. Adjoins Langstone settlement boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
- Representation Text: The development of the site would not add to the pressure for further land release in Langstone other than the limited opportunity for infill sites within the settlement.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- Representation Text: Yes. The site is fully deliverable in the earlier part of the plan period. It is the ownership of Sir Robert McAlpine who would obtain the planning consents and provide the necessary infrastructure and provide housebuilders with serviced areas. There are no constraints to the development of the site.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- Representation Text: Yes. A change to the settlement boundary and housing designation.
- Council Response: Requires changes to the settlement boundary and countryside designation.
Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

Representation Text:
No.

Council Response:
DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR HOUSING AND VILLAGE CENTRE WITH ASSOCIATED ROADS SEWERS AND RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE 98/0192 03-Feb-1999 REFUSED

ERECTION OF 5NO. APARTMENTS AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY 394/28 (LANGSTONE) 07/0136 04-Jul-2007 GRANTED

LANGSTONE COMMUNITY COUNCIL: Object for the following reasons:
- The parking spaces are less than that required. To state that a bus service is available close by is irrelevant.
- The proposed building is set forward of the building line on Tregan Road.
- Three storey developments should not be permitted.
- Cars would park in the visibility splays.
- No connection to the existing drains should be permitted.
- Over-development compared to other properties on Tregan Road.
18 Letters of objection for the following reasons:
- Extra vehicles will add to congestion on a narrow road.
- Development is taller than existing properties on Tregan Road and out of character.
- Any parking on the road would obstruct access to the existing properties.
- Extra traffic and on-road parking would be a source of danger to children walking to school.
- 3 storey building would remove privacy of existing neighbouring properties.
- Sewerage system is at capacity.
- Scale of the building considerably more than existing properties.
- There are no apartments on Tregan Road and they would be out of keeping / character.
- It would set a precedent for further similar development.
- Concern over the cess pit and how it would be emptied.

DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR HOUSING A VILLAGE CENTRE AND ASSOCIATED ROADS AND LANDSCAPING 99/0780 08-Dec-1999 REFUSED

DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR LOW DENSITY HOUSING (20 NO. DWELLINGS) ADJACENT TO FOOTPATH NO. 14 95/1085 23-Feb-1996 REFUSED

ERECTION OF 31 DWELLINGS WITH ANCILLARY WORKS 97/0294 22-Apr-1998 GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for mixed use development for residential, employment and commercial purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
- Representation Text: The Growth Strategy for Newport has not been achieved so far and will unlikely to be achieved unless there is a sufficient range and choice of housing sites in areas which are attractive to the market. There is currently an over-concentration of large sites in areas which are not attractive to the market, which require major infrastructure improvements and /or remediation and some of which are in multiple ownerships. The site at Oak Court is in one ownership, it is an attractive location to the market, it has no constraints and it is deliverable in the early part of the LDP period. It would therefore make a valuable contribution to that LDP's Growth Strategy.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
- Representation Text: Yes.
### Question: SA Recommendation

It is recommended that only the previously developed sites are considered for development. Development in the ASA should be avoided where possible.

Public open space be provided as part of development, especially where development includes residential provision or employment.

It should be ensured that there will be no net increase in surface water runoff as a result of development to reduce the increased risk of flooding through the development of the greenfield site, the development of the greenfield site, especially where this may include sensitive uses such as residential accommodation.

It should be ensured that the mix of uses provided on site cover the full range of community services and facilities required within walking distance including those in Table 3.4.

### Council Response:

The candidate site is a large greenfield site on the western edge of Newport, with the southern section forming part of the St Brides SSSI. The land has been identified as an area of high value in the LANDMAP assessment that formed the evidence base for the Wentlooge Levels Special Landscape Area designation, which this sites forms part of.

Development of this site would cross the strong physical boundary provided by the Duffryn Link Road, and extend into the Green Wedge without a firm boundary. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Similarly, the Plan allocates sufficient employment and regeneration sites to meet Newport’s requirements. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for development would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

Given the environmental and landscape value associated with this greenfield site and that sufficient housing and employment land is allocated in the LDP, it is recommended that the candidate site is not allocated for development.

### Question: Overall Council Response

The candidate site is a large greenfield site on the western edge of Newport, with the southern section forming part of the St Brides SSSI. The land has been identified as an area of high value in the LANDMAP assessment that formed the evidence base for the Wentlooge Levels Special Landscape Area designation, which this sites forms part of.

Development of this site would cross the strong physical boundary provided by the Duffryn Link Road, and extend into the Green Wedge without a firm boundary. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Similarly, the Plan allocates sufficient employment and regeneration sites to meet Newport’s requirements. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for development would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

Given the environmental and landscape value associated with this greenfield site and that sufficient housing and employment land is allocated in the LDP, it is recommended that the candidate site is not allocated for development.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land at Coedkernew

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Coedkernew

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 27 83

**Council Response:** 327399 183701
### Question: 2.4 Site Area
**Representation Text:**
- 160 hectares

**Council Response:**
- 153.2 ha.

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description
**Representation Text:**
- Golf course and agricultural land

### Question: 2.6 Current Use
**Representation Text:**
- Golf course and agricultural

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
**Representation Text:**
- Comprehensive development to include residential / commercial / industrial uses.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
**Representation Text:**
- Yes. Part. The site comprises an existing golf course and agricultural land.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
**Representation Text:**
- No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
**Representation Text:**
- Yes. Part. Much of the site comprises a golf course. The majority of the agricultural land is Grade 3 with some areas of Grade 2 and 3A in the north and east.

**Council Response:**
- Welsh Government comment: There is a moderate probability of BMV at this site. The indicators of surface wetness and high FCD suggest the likely grades will be limited to 3a and 3b. The soils are better towards the North of the site and the likely grade is higher in these areas with a higher probability of there being BMV land. A post revision survey directly to the Northwest of the site found a mixture of subgrades 3a and 3b. Moderate Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
**Representation Text:**
- The development would be designed to take account of environmental and landscape issues which characterize this locality.

**Council Response:**
- Countryside comments:
  - Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
**Representation Text:**
- Yes. These would be protected where possible and a landscaping scheme carried out to mitigate lany loss.
Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

Representation Text: To be agreed.

Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

Representation Text: Yes. To be agreed.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

Representation Text: Yes. Southern part of site falls within an archaeologically sensitive area but mitigation measures would be taken.

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Southern area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Also on edge between solid geology and alluvium of the Levels. This area especially around All Saints Church likely locations of settlements of all periods. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

Representation Text: Yes. Part

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

Representation Text: Yes. The site is partly Zone C1 but no problems are envisaged with regard to providing flood protection.

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.7 SSSI?

Representation Text: Yes. Part of the site is affected by and SSSI but mitigation measures can be taken

Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

Representation Text: None known
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

---

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Listed building n/a
  Ancient monuments n/a
  historic park n/a
  conservation area n/a

**Within Newport boundary**

---

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. A number of options exist to provide satisfactory access.
- **Council Response:** Yes, Duffryn Link/Church Lane A48. No Specific proposals. Transport assesment required. Access of Church Lane requires substancial improvements.

---

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

- **Representation Text:** By increasing public access to on-site provision of open space.
- **Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population. The existing community facilities would be inadequate to sustain the size of development area proposed. The master plan would need to meets the requirements of TAN16 for the provision of Sport, Recreation and Open Space.

---

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

- **Representation Text:** The site is close to existing public transport links and public transport could be extended to serve this site.

---

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

- **Representation Text:** The scale of development proposed is such that appropriate public transport could be provided.
- **Council Response:** A48- Site frontage- 2km

---

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

- **Representation Text:** A range of bus services operate in the locality providing frequent and regular trips.
- **Council Response:** 10-20 Min Frequency

---

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

- **Representation Text:** Nearest station Newport approximately 5 kilometres away.
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**Council Response:** Newport - 6km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
Local shops accessible and new facilities could be provided.

**Council Response:**
Asda- Duffryn 2.3Km
Duffryn Shops 2.5Km

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
Close proximity

**Council Response:**
No footways and Duffryn Link Road development must provide suitable pedestrian & cycling facilities and improvements.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**
This would be incorporated into the design of the proposed development. The site would be accessible to a range of facilities and services etc by foot and cycle.

**Council Response:**
Various footpaths cross the site.
PROW FPs 390/17; 390/18; 390/15; 390/23; 390/14.

(Not all owned by Hicks. also extensive ownership by WAG, Baker the Duffryn, et al.)

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. These would be incorporated and diverted as appropriate.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:**
Unknown

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. There is a range of services within the locality.

**Council Response:**
Duffryn primary and comprehensive schools are about 4km away.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The proposal is in the public realm as it was submitted as a major candidate site.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**
The scheme would involve the provision of community facilities, new employment opportunities and choice of housing.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

16/02/2012
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**Summary:** Candidate Site for comprehensive development including residential / commercial / industrial uses.

**Rep'n/Para/Policy:**

- **Question:** 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
  - **Representation Text:** Yes. Loss of golf course but provision of public open space would be made within the scheme.

- **Question:** 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
  - **Representation Text:** New sub stations or pumping stations may be required and can be provided as necessary, but no abnormal service provision costs are envisaged for the proposed development.

  **Welsh Water Comments**

  Sewerage

  From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

  Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

  Water supply

  It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

  A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

  **Sewerage treatment**

  No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

- **Question:** 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
  - **Representation Text:** The proposal is for a mixed use development including employment uses and the site is in close proximity to existing major employment uses. It is not anticipated that there would be a conflict between uses in this development proposal.

- **Question:** 6.5 Logical Extension?
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**Summary:** Candidate Site for comprehensive development including residential / commercial / industrial uses.

**Representation Text:**
The allocation of the land would represent a major sustainable urban extension to the west of Newport.

**Council Response:**
Development would cross the strong physical boundary provided by the Duffryn Link Road, and extend into the Green Wedge without a firm boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**
The proposal could reduce the pressure for development on other less appropriate sites.

**Council Response:**
The lack of a strong physical boundary would make further development hard to control.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**
No. The site is in the ownership of two families (the Hicks and the Bakers) and WAG.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**
None known

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**
1-3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**
The settlement boundary would need to be amended to include the site and green wedge and countryside designations deleted.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**
Unknown

**Council Response:**
ERECUTION OF HOTEL AFFECTING FOOTPATH 14 00/0170 05-Apr-2000 REFUSED Consultee Response:
Drainage Board - require information about surface water drainage (see 99/1028 response) Highway - require Church Lane to be widened ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Object no details as disposal of foul drainage due to the water table this could cause an environmental nuisance.
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**CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL DWELLING TO NURSING/RESIDENTIAL HOME**

- **93/1126 22-Dec-1993**
  - **REFUSED**

**CONSTRUCTION OF PRESS AND MOULD OFFICE WELFARE FACILITIES AND GATEHOUSES AS PART OF THE LG ELECTRONICS MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT (RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION RELATING TO PREVIOUS PLANNING PERMISSION 96/0663/OE)**

- **97/0356 28-Jun-1997**
  - **GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS**

**INSTALLATION OF A NATURAL GAS PIPELINE TO SERVE THE NEW SEVERN POWER STATION**

- **08/0181 12-Mar-2008**
  - **NO OBJECTIONS OR CONDITIONS**

**CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW FOOT BRIDGE OVER THE RE-ALIGNED A48 TO INCLUDE SPIRAL RAMPED ACCESS AND ILLUMINATED WALKWAY AND ARCH (PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITION 01 RELATING TO PLANNING APPROVAL 96/0863/DC)**

- **97/0444 11-Jun-1997**
  - **GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS**

**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE)**

- **97/1048 15-Dec-1997**
  - **REFUSED**

**DEVELOPMENT OF HOTEL WITH ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATH 18 (COEDKERNEW)**

- **99/0408 23-Jun-1999**
  - **REFUSED**

**DEVELOPMENT OF DUAL CARRIAGEWAY DISTRIBUTOR ROAD BETWEEN THE DUFFRYN LINK (WEST) AND DOCKS WAY**

- **99/0695 23-Oct-2002**
  - **WITHDRAWN**

**ERECTION OF 2 NO. DWELLINGS FOR USE AS STAFF ACCOMMODATION**

- **01/0666 24-Oct-2001**
  - **REFUSED**

**ERECTION OF 50 BED HOTEL AND ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAYS 390/14, 390/23 AND 390/18**

- **09/0357 12-Aug-2009**
  - **GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS**
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**Summary:** Candidate Site for comprehensive development including residential / commercial / industrial uses.

---

**UNDERGROUND SUBMERSIBLE PUMPING STATION CONTROL CUBICLE AND VEHICLE ACCESS**

90/0293 06-Apr-1990

NO OBJECTIONS (TREES IN CON AREA)

**PROPOSED ERECTION AND EXTENSION OF APPROXIMATELY 2090M OF 132KV OVERHEAD LINES SUPPORTED BY 17 STEEL LATTICE TOWERS AND 8 LOW LEVEL GANTRIES**

97/0087 09-Mar-1997

NO OBJECTIONS (TREES IN CON AREA)

---

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** Unknown

---

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** Unknown

---

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**

The land at Coedkernew occupies arguably one of the best strategic locations in South Wales and is visually inconspicuous, level and easy to develop with no overriding constraints. Its allocation for comprehensive development including residential, commercial and industrial would make a major contribution to achieving the level of sustainable growth required in the LDP.

The allocation of the land for comprehensive development would represent a major sustainable urban extension opportunity to the west of Newport that would not significantly erode the gap between Cardiff and Newport. The allocation would not affect the green belt designation further to the west and the area would be sensitively landscaped in order that it does not have an unacceptable visual impact.

The land is in close proximity to existing major employment uses and would add further local employment and shopping opportunities within easy walking and cycling distance. The facilities in the town centre would be accessible by convenient bus services and as the land borders the mainline railway to London a new railway station could be provided to improve public transport opportunities further.

The southern portion of the site is contained within the SSSI and mitigation measures will be required to preserve/enhance the species in the reens which the designation is protecting.

The M4 Relief Road (M4RR) will be constructed along the eastern boundary of the site with the proposed western junction being located immediately adjacent to our client's Parc Golf land.

The site is deliverable and benefits from existing good transportation and utilities infrastructure serving the LG development. It is level, easy to develop with good access, and there are no overriding landscape or ecological issues (which are incapable of resolution) which would prevent the development of the site.

---

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.
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**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Agent:** Derek Prosser Associates

**Site:** 11/ Claremont, Malpas (East of)

**New Site**

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land East of Claremont, Malpas

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Land East of Claremont, Malpas

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** 3309 1915

---

**Question:** SA Recommendation

It should be ensured that any important landscape features such as trees or hedgerows are retained. Any potential contamination of land or effect on watercourses should be minimised.

**Council Response:**

The site is a Greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Malpas, designated as green wedge. The Pilton Vale brook, a site of nature importance (SINC), runs through the site. The land has also been identified as an area of moderate to high value in the LANDMAP assessment that formed the evidence base for the West of Rhiwderin Special Landscape Area designation, which this site forms part of.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.

Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8

This site was also considered as part of the Unitary Development Plan inquiry. In considering whether the site should be included in the Unitary Development Plan for housing development, the Inspector recommended that the site should not be allocated (Ref M.26) and that the site would unacceptably compromise the openness of the green wedge (Ref para. 3.102 of the Inspectors Report)

It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated as Green Wedge and that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation.

---

**Question:** Overall Council Response

The site is a Greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Malpas, designated as green wedge. The Pilton Vale brook, a site of nature importance (SINC), runs through the site. The land has also been identified as an area of moderate to high value in the LANDMAP assessment that formed the evidence base for the West of Rhiwderin Special Landscape Area designation, which this site forms part of.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.

Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8

This site was also considered as part of the Unitary Development Plan inquiry. In considering whether the site should be included in the Unitary Development Plan for housing development, the Inspector recommended that the site should not be allocated (Ref M.26) and that the site would unacceptably compromise the openness of the green wedge (Ref para. 3.102 of the Inspectors Report)

It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated as Green Wedge and that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation.
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**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
- **Representation Text:** 4.85
- **Council Response:** 4.63ha.

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- **Representation Text:** Open field(s) between residential estate and A4042 Malpas By-pass.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text:** Unmanaged grassland.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text:** Residential development.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Last use agricultural but now isolated by by-pass. Classification not known.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** No particular quality of landscape. Development would not be visible from by-pass, but would be visible from south and west. Limited landscape treatment would soften impact.
- **Council Response:** Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and fringe Public Open Space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Area next to ecological park at Pilton Vales. Public Open Space. Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Not protected as far as I am aware.
- **Council Response:** TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Archaeology? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Greenfield? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Contaminated Land Risk? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Flood Risk? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Adjacent to Water Course? Yes. A stream passes through western part of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Topography / Stability Problems? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>SSSI? No. Pilton Vale Brook which runs through the site is a site of Interest for Nature Conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Protected Species? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Conservation Area or Listed Building? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Access to Highway?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site East of Claremont for Residential Development

By appropriately sited and balanced development.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site East of Claremont for Residential Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Council Response:**

no.

No access to A4042.

access would have to be granted unto Claremont. Transport assessment required. To assess impact.

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**

By integration within residential layout.

**Council Response:**

The proposed development falls within the Malpas Ward that has a shortfall in Formal Play of 8.51Ha and Equipped Play of 2.34Ha. This site would require a LEAP provision as the nearest play facility is approximately 1Km (2Km by road) from the site. This would meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development. Off site contribution for the upgrading of formal play space locally would also be required. The nearest informal play space (400sqm) would be inadequate to support a development of this size.

**Question: 4.11** Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:**

By providing links within scheme.

**Question: 4.2** Bus Route?

**Representation Text:**

A short walk.

**Council Response:**

Almond Dr. 5-10 mins Malpas Rd.

**Question: 4.3** Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:**

Several hourly.

**Council Response:**

Claremont 30 mins for 09:24

**Question: 4.4** Railway Station?

**Representation Text:**

3 kilometres.

**Council Response:**

Over 4km to railway station.

**Question: 4.5** Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:**

Parc y Prior 6-8 shops (Malpas estate)

**Council Response:**

Parc-y-Prior shops about 700 metres.

**Question: 4.6** Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:**

Bus routes provide accessibility to jobs and city centre. Schools and local community services in Malpas accessible by foot.

**Council Response:**

Parc-y-Prior pub/restaurant about 700 metres.

**Question: 4.7** Walking and Cycling?

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccesnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site East of Claremont for Residential Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
- By integrating with local provision on adjoining residential estates.
- No links to public highway.

**Council Response:**
- Not known.

**Question: 4.8** Public Rights of Way?
- Representation Text: Not known.

**Question: 4.9** Open Space?
- Representation Text: Within 200m.

**Question: 5.1** Schools?
- Representation Text: Yes. Parc-y-Prior (pub/restaurant)
- Council Response: Malpas Park Primary School about 700 metres. Newport High School, Bettws Lane, about 2.7km (1.75 miles).

**Question: 5.2** Community Engagement?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 5.3** Community Aspirations?
- Representation Text: By planning gain and provision of required housing numbers in a sustainable location.

**Question: 5.4** Loss of Recreational Facilities?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.1** Infrastructure Proximity?
- Representation Text: Immediately adjoining.

**Question: 6.2** Neighbouring Development Issues?
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.3** Infrastructure Capacity?
- Representation Text: Yes.
- Council Response: Welsh Water Comments
  - Sewerage
    - From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be...
Summary: Candidate Site East of Claremont for Residential Development

considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: Immediately adjoining and contained by by-pass.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text: Provides opportunity for land to south controlled by Council to be developed (see letter).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site East of Claremont for Residential Development

**Council Response:** Council-owned land to the south is designated as Environmental Space in the UDP.

**Question: 7.1** Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2** Site Owner?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3** Interest in Adjoining Land?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4** Restrictive Covenants?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5** Realistic Timescale?

**Representation Text:** Yes. 4-6 years.

**Question: 7.6** Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Green wedge needs to be redrawn locally.

**Council Response:** The site is designated as Countryside and Green Wedge in the UDP.

**Question: 7.7** Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** 98/0528 28-Jul-1998 Granted with Conditions In basement.

**Question: 7.8** Planning Application Refusals?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9** Planning Applications Pending?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8** Other Information?

**Representation Text:** Please see copy letter dated 22 October 2008 (submitted as Major Candidate Site):

Please find attached a completed representation form and site location plans to identify the site and its relationship with the built-up area. In submitting these plans, I acknowledge the
The planning process has moved on considerably and the adoption of the UDP has given rise to numerous commitments, particularly in respect of housing development sites. However, while permissions have been granted for major developments, the current economic climate shows up the weakness of allocating major sites which depend on the provision of extensive and expensive infrastructure. Also, the dependence on the regeneration opportunities available on brownfield sites along the Usk river frontage and close to the City Centre has led to limited types of housing which serve only limited householder needs.

I draw your attention to the 2 Assembly for Wales Housing objectives in Planning Policy WALES. These are to provide:-
* homes that are in good condition, in safe neighbourhoods and sustainable communities, and
* greater choice for people over the type of housing and the location they live in, recognising the needs of all, including those in need of affordable or special needs housing in both urban and rural areas.

The Assembly sets out that local planning authorities should promote sustainable residential environments, avoid large housing areas of monotonous character and make appropriate provision for affordable housing. Amongst other criteria, they should promote:-
* development that is easily accessible by public transport; cycling and walking;
* attractive landscapes around dwellings with usable open space and regard for biodiversity and nature conservation;
* greater emphasis on quality and designing places for people;
* the most efficient use of land; and
* well designed living environments, where appropriate at increased densities.

In suggesting that this site be allocated for housing development we are confident it would pass the test of any criteria-based approach your Council might use in developing a settlement/housing strategy.

The suggested development area can be readily assembled with land to the south owned by the City Council to provide a comprehensive residential development of in the order of 250-300 houses (100-125 on the Farrow and Blease land and 150-175 on Newport City land). The development would not depend upon prior provision of expensive infrastructure and would offer a viable, deliverable, sustainable and accessible housing opportunity.

In brief, access can be taken from Pillmawr Road from the south and through land owned by the City Council. It is considered the local highway network has the capacity to accommodate traffic movements generated by the proposed scale of development. Local bus routes can be extended to make more efficient and effective use of the services. The site can be developed without adverse impact on neighbouring land uses with limited impact upon views of the surrounding area. There appear to be no insurmountable physical constraints to development. The site would be available for immediate development. The site is within walking distance of many local and community facilities. These include the Parc Y Prior Local Shopping Centre, Malpas Park Primary School, St Josephs Hospital and Rougemont School. Footpath and cycleway connections could be provided to existing routes to build upon the sustainability credentials of the proposed development.

The development of this site would make effective use of unused marginal land which even has limited value as part of an inappropriate green wedge allocation because the adjoining Relief Road is a prominent physical feature and a more natural and defensible boundary to this part of Newport.

The brief introduction to the site as a major housing candidate site acknowledges the request for only preliminary details of the site at this stage. Fuller information will be provided in due course.
## Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

### 144

**Robert Hitchins Ltd**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site proposal for residential development at Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 45/ Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth (Robert Hitchins)

**New Site**

#### Question: Representation Texts

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
- May affect a SINC designated site: potential effects should be investigated and mitigated prior to development on site.
- Public rights of way as well as additional walking and cycling routes (including safe routes to school) should be developed through the design process.
- Development should be located away from the watercourse as part of the river walkway scheme to reduce potential pollution to water resources.
- It is recommended that local convenience stores are provided as part of the mix of uses to reduce the need to travel.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
- This site is put forward in conjunction with the land immediately to the north, submitted by Redrow Homes (ref: 65.C2). As noted in the Council’s response to representation 65.C2 this site was considered at the Unitary Development Plan Inquiry for inclusion in plan as a residential allocation. In relation to the Redrow part of the land the Inspector commented “the site is clearly part of the countryside on the outskirts of Pentrepoeth and for it to be developed as proposed it would be necessary to demonstrate a need for housing that outweighed the broad thrust of policies seeking to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the countryside” (para 3.80). With specific reference to this candidate site (ref 144.C1) the Inspector notes that it is “predominantly open fields on the edge of the settlement and other than referring to a possible Bassaleg by pass – a scheme to which, in the absence of any assessment of need or feasibility, I attach little weight” (para 3.84). Circumstances are not considered to have changed in relation to this greenfield site.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in the countryside cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The site is also identified as an area of high value in the LANDMAP assessment that formed the basis of the designated Special Landscape Areas – West of Rhiwderin, which the candidate site forms part of.

It is therefore recommended that the candidate site is not allocated for housing in the Local Development Plan.

#### Question: Site Name

**Representation Text:** Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth

#### Question: Location

**Representation Text:** Land off Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth

#### Question: Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 267 864

16/02/2012
Summary: Candidate Site proposal for residential development at Penylan Road, Penpeloeth.

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
Representation Text: 6.64 ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
Representation Text: The site is undulating with a mainly hedge boundary with several mature trees within the site. Residential development is to the west of the site.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
Representation Text: Agriculture

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
Representation Text: Residential Development

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
Representation Text: No

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
Representation Text: No

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
Representation Text: Yes. Grade 2 and 3

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
Representation Text: When addressing development in this location the previous Inspector stated in paragraph 3.79 ‘The inward facing nature of the local landform means that development on the site would not be widely visible from the open countryside to the south west’

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
Representation Text: Yes. To the best of our knowledge the trees within the site are not protected
Council Response: Tree Preservation Orders covering:
Summary: Candidate Site proposal for residential development at Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth.

Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- group consisting of 3 alders & 1 willow tree
- group consisting of 4 alders
- group consisting of 11 alder and 1 ash.
- Oak
- Oak
- The several hawthorn, field maple and holly standing in the area numbered A16 on the map
- The several hazel, hawthorn and holly trees standing in the area numbered A17 on the map
- Broadleaved woodland consisting of alder, beech, cherry and holly.
- Mixed conifers and deciduous trees consisting mainly of oak, birch, alder, ash, sweet chestnut, beech and larch adjoin the site.

Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

Representation Text:
- The majority of trees and hedgerows on the site will be included in the development of the site

Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

Representation Text:
- No.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

Representation Text:
- No. None known

Council Response:
- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Crossed by line of Roman Road. Fairly Significant RestraintWill need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

Representation Text:
- Yes.

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

Representation Text:
- No.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

Representation Text:
- No.

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

Representation Text:
- Yes. A stream runs along the sites western boundary though as shown on the EA's website the site is not within a floodplain.

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
### Candidate Site proposal for residential development at Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question: 3.7 - SSSI?
**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.8 - Protected Species?
**Representation Text:** No. None known

**Council Response:** There is a species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

#### Question: 3.9 - Conservation Area or Listed Building?
**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

#### Question: 4.1 - Access to Highway?
**Representation Text:** Yes. The site can be accessed off Penylan Road or through the land being promoted to the north

**Council Response:**
- Yes- Penylan Rd
- Doubtful -Traffic Assessment to assess road width at 4.5-5m - substandard
- Junction Penylan Rd/ Caerphilly Rd -Lack of Capacity Priority junction
- Lack of footways. 60mph.

#### Question: 4.10 - Open Space Linkage Improvement?
**Representation Text:** Open space would be provided within the development and other open space and community facilities are within walking and cycling distance

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population. The existing community facilities would be inadequate to sustain the size of development area proposed.

#### Question: 4.11 - Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
**Representation Text:** This site is already in close proximity to bus routes and the added population could help sustain and improve the service.

#### Question: 4.2 - Bus Route?
**Representation Text:** There are several bus stops along the Caerphilly Road within walking distance of the site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site proposal for residential development at Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:** Caerphilly Road is 0.7km from the site.

**Question: 4.3** Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:** Route 50 which stops along the Caerphilly Road runs every 30 minutes

**Council Response:** 30 mins

**Question: 4.4** Railway Station?

**Representation Text:** Newport railway station is approximately 4 miles by road

**Council Response:** 3.5 miles

**Question: 4.5** Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:** A range of shops is located approximately 1km from the centre of the site.

**Council Response:** Lavel Road - 1.1km
Post Office and shops

**Question: 4.6** Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:** A large industrial estate is located north of the site

**Council Response:** Over 3km away.

**Question: 4.7** Walking and Cycling?

**Representation Text:** The site is within walking and cycling distances of both a primary and secondary school and community facilities.

**Council Response:** Poor - Lack of flyways walking and cycling - unlikely to be encouraged.

**Question: 4.8** Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:** No. None known

**Council Response:** 393/115, 116, 117

**Question: 4.9** Open Space?

**Representation Text:** An equipped area of play is approx 500m from the centre of the site. Though open space would be provided within the site.

**Question: 5.1** Schools?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** Pentrepoeth PS 1.5km,
Bassaleg Comprehensive 0.6km.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.2</th>
<th>Community Engagement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.3</th>
<th>Community Aspirations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Development of this site and land immediately to the north will form a sustainable urban extension which could provide added community facilities to the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.4</th>
<th>Loss of Recreational Facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.1</th>
<th>Infrastructure Proximity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The dwellings adjacent and surrounding the site are supplied with services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.2</th>
<th>Neighbouring Development Issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.3</th>
<th>Infrastructure Capacity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Welsh Water Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.4</th>
<th>Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/02/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009 P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**
This site is adjacent the built up edge and in close proximity to services and facilities.

**Council Response:**
The site adjoins the urban boundary for 50 metres, but for the rest is divorced from the urban area.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The development of this site would follow land to the north which is deliverable in the next 5 years.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The site is currently outside of the development boundary.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING LOCAL CENTRE AND PRIMARY SCHOOL INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS 93/0206 25/02/1994 Refused

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF 66 HECTARES (163 ACRES) OF LAND TO COMPRISE HOUSING RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS (OUTLINE) - DUPLICATE APPLICATION 90/0992 09/11/1990 Refused
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

By: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site proposal for residential development at Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF 66 HECTARES (163 ACRES) OF LAND TO COMPRIZE HOUSING RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS (OUTLINE)**

90/0910 14/05/1992 Dismissed at Appeal (Appeal number A907)

**DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING HOUSING AND RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS - DUPLICATE APPLICATION**

90/0428 09/11/1990 Refused

**HOUSING AND ASSOCIATED USES INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS**

94/0521 06/01/1997 Dismissed at Appeal (Appeal A1385)

Adjacent Site:

- **00/0818** - CREATION OF FISHING LAKE AFFECTING FOOTPATH NO’S 7(393/96) AND 9(393/117) – Granted with Conditions – 25/10/2000
- **94/0522** – Proposed Bassaleg By-Pass – Refused – 06/01/1997

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:** This candidate site in conjunction with the land immediately to the north, submitted by Redrow Homes, would form a deliverable, comprehensive and sustainable urban extension adjacent the urban edge. This area is readily accessible by means other than the private car to a range of facilities and services. The previous Inspector has already noted that there are no insurmountable barriers and that this is a sustainable location. Therefore this site and the land to the north would make an important contribution to meeting the LDP’s Growth Strategy.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.
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155  Gwent Healthcare NHS Trust  Agent: Asbri Planning

Rep'n/Para/Policy  AccessnNo  DateLodgd  Late?  Source  Type  Mode  Status  Status Modified  Summary

155.C1  06/05/2009  P  W  ME

Summary: Candidate Site for residential-led mix of uses on St Cadoc's Hospital site

Site: 59/1 St Cadoc's

New Site

Question: Representation Texts

Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response: The representation acknowledges the need for archaeological investigation works and avoidance of the area designated as flood zone C. It should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted. It should be ensured that all TPOs and mature trees are retained. The potential for the delivery of tourism facilities as part of the mix of uses, to enhance the attraction of the Roman settlement could be explored.

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: The Welsh Health Estates and Gwent Healthcare Trust have made clear its long term intention to phase out the hospital use on the St Cadocs site. The Newport Unitary Development Plan allocated the site for a mix use scheme including 8 hectares of land for up to 250 residential units, Environmental Space, and a train station. Given the uncertainty over the timing of the release of the land and deliverability within the plan period, a housing allocation has not been made in the Local Development Plan.

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: St Cadocs Hospital Site

Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: South of Lodge Road, Caerleon

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Representation Text: ST 331 909

Council Response: 333165 190918

Question: 2.4 Site Area

Representation Text: 18 hectares

Council Response: 18.67ha.

Question: 2.5 Brief Description

Representation Text: Hospital Site set in landscaped grounds.

Question: 2.6 Current Use

Representation Text: Hospital with ancillary office and teaching uses.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for residential-led mix of uses on St Cadoc’s Hospital site

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text: Residential-led mix of uses.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

Representation Text: Yes. Hospital, set in landscaped grounds, with ancillary office and teaching uses.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Representation Text: The site is part of the urban fabric of the area. Development would need to be sympathetic to the area and allow for protected trees.

Council Response: Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

Representation Text: Yes. Mature trees some of which are protected by TPOs.

Council Response: Tree Preservation Orders cover:

- Pine
  - 1 Robina, 6 Pine, 3 Larch
  - 12 Birch, 5 Cherry, 6 Oak, 7 Hawthorn, 9 Prunus
  - 10 hawthorn, 4 birch, 11 cherry, 1 oak
  - 36 Pine
  - 2 Ash, 2 Cypress
  - Beech
  - Horse Chestnuts (11)
  - Cedars (7)
  - Weeping Ash (11)
  - Acers (9)
  - Plane (2)
  - Holly (3)
  - Malus
  - Multi Stem Cypress (2)
  - Cypress (3)
  - Lime (28)
  - Oak (18)
  - Sweet Chestnut
  - Ash (3)
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<thead>
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<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
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<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

Summary: Candidate Site for residential-led mix of uses on St Cadoc's Hospital site

- **Oak:**
- **Sycamore / Acer**
- **Multi-stem Robinia**
- **Field Maple**
- **Young Oak**

The various trees standing within the area labelled A1 consisting of Silver Birch, platanus orientalis, Carpinus betulus fastigata, Robina inermis, Fagus sylvatica, Castanea sativa, Populus tacamahaca, Populus gelrica, Populus serotina aurea, salix alba.


**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

**Representation Text:**

- Retention of open space, trees and other sensitive areas.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:**

- As above.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Close to Roman settlement of Caerleon.

**Council Response:**

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Archaeologically Sensitive Area

- Immediately outside Roman fortress of Isca. In Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Area crossed by Roman Road and burials have been found. Likelihood of Roman settlement being located in area.
- Fairly Significant RestraintWill need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Only small part of site in its south-western section.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
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**Question: 3.7** SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Woodland and buildings on the site may form habitats for bats but no evidence of roosts.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

**Within Newport boundary**

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** Site is considered to be accessible for the public highway. Proposed uses not confirmed. Rail halt anticipated to alleviate anticipated traffic generation. Traffic Assessment required.

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
- Retained open space area on site plus new bridge link over railway as part of cycleway scheme.

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Caerleon Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 3.64Ha. This site would require a LEAP and 2 LAP provision to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development. In addition off site contribution for the upgrading of formal play space locally that can be accessed by road (Approximately 1Km) or the proposed bridge over the railway lines (Approximately 500m) to the south of the development.

**Question: 4.11** Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:** Bus routes already accessible at short distance from site. Potential rail halt.

**Question: 4.2** Bus Route?

**Representation Text:** Adjacent to site along Lodge Road.

**Council Response:** adjacent to site.

**Question: 4.3** Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:** Half hourly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for residential-led mix of uses on St Cadoc's Hospital site

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
- **Representation Text:** Newport Station - 4 kilometres (Proposed new station at Caerleon adjacent to site).
- **Council Response:** newport central station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
- **Representation Text:** Caerleon District Centre, approx 500 metres.
- **Council Response:**
  - 450 metres to station road shop
  - 750 metres to central area
  - 30 metres to lodge hill shop

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
- **Representation Text:** Within 1 km radius range of facilities in Caerleon including schools, university, Western Industrial Estate.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- **Representation Text:** Presence of new route along Pillmawr Road. Current proposals for extension through site.
- **Council Response:**
  - On site provision & infrastructure linking on to/enhancing Caerleon - city centre cycle route.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- **Representation Text:** Playing fields to south of railway line - 300m.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Lodge Hill primary school (300m). Caerleon Comprehensive (500m).

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Extensive consultation at UDP stage.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- **Representation Text:** Retained features.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
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<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential-led mix of uses on St Cadoc's Hospital site</td>
</tr>
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**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- Representation Text: Services already serving existing development.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Council Response:**

**Sewage**

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

**Nash Waste Water Treatment Works**

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.
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**Summary:** Candidate Site for residential-led mix of uses on St Cadoc's Hospital site

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

---

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** Contained by existing residential development and railway line.

**Council Response:** Site is within existing urban boundary in the UDP.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** Development of site would not set precedent for reasons above.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Latter stage of plan period linked to hospital rationalization proposals.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Area in west of site identified as open space.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
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**Representation Text:**

DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES (OUTLINE)

90/1062 04/01/1991 Refused

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**

- See previous submission document:

1.0INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Promotional Submission Statement has been prepared on behalf of Gwent Healthcare NHS Trust who are the landowners of the site concerned. The site consists of the current hospital complex, part of which is currently allocated for residential development in the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan,

1.2 As procedures in the new Local Development Plan system involve the review of previous proposals this submission is made in order that the land is retained in the new plan as a residential land allocation. Additional land allocated for open space purposes to the west of the hospital buildings should also be considered due to the land no longer being required for playing field purposes. Unallocated parts of the eastern section of the site will also be released for development during the Plan period.

1.3 It is acknowledged that the site has particular characteristics and a sympathetic form of development, which preserves its best features, will be necessary.

1.4 This submission, therefore, in promoting the site for residential development will provide a description of the site at Section 2, review the planning policies relevant to the site at Section 3, provides an appraisal of the development at Section 4 and draw together the key points and conclusions at Section 5.

2.0DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The submission site extends to some 18 hectares in total area and has an irregular shape. It is located between the main Newport to Abergavenny railway line to the south and Lodge Road to the north. It lies approximately 750 metres to the north-west of the Caerleon District Centre and some 4.5 kilometres north-east of Newport City Centre.

2.2 The site is gently sloping with a rise in levels towards the north. It consists of 3 distinct areas. These are:-

- The older, original buildings with associated landscaped grounds in the central part of the site
- The western part of the site which is mainly open land with a large, single-storey block, Glen Usk, extending from the main complex
- The eastern part of the site which has several buildings, including those accommodating health services and the school of nursing.

Each of these distinct areas is described in turn below.

The Central Part of the Site

2.3 The central part of the site is occupied by the original hospital buildings which date from 1902. The buildings are of red brick and slate roof construction and predominantly 2-storeys
in height. Six linked wing blocks, radiate from the centre, 3 on either side, which together with the central, entrance block form a crescent shape. Each of the blocks has distinctive bay frontages with Italianate bell towers rising from central courtyard areas. The central block has a portico entrance with 3 gables. A clock tower rises above the entrance and the central gable. Corridors from the rear of the entrance block link the various parts of the complex radiate. An area to the east, which previously accommodated tennis courts, is also used for car parking. To the south of the access road, which runs parallel with the railway line, a pipeline crosses the railway. On the opposite side is an area which has allotment gardens, a cemetery, golf course and playing fields. Caerleon Comprehensive School lies directly to the south.

2.4 The frontage of the buildings face south towards the railway (set in a cutting) and overlook attractive landscaped areas of lawns fringed by mature trees. These grounds also accommodate 2 distinctive, octagonal ‘pavilions’. The hospital’s entrance is fronted by a circle containing flower beds, either side of which are parking areas, and from which point roads serving different parts of the complex radiate. An area to the east, which previously accommodated tennis courts, is also used for car parking. To the south of the access road, which runs parallel with the railway line, a pipeline crosses the railway. On the opposite side is an area which has allotment gardens, a cemetery, golf course and playing fields. Caerleon Comprehensive School lies directly to the south.

2.5 To the north of the main hospital buildings, a single carriageway service road which accesses works and estates functions, links the two entrances off Lodge Road. A grassed area, rising above a steep embankment and fronting onto Lodge Road occupies this part of the site along with individual buildings, including a dwelling, North Lodge, at the eastern entrance and a service building with a small parking area to the west. Beyond the western entrance is a care facility, Abbeyfield, which is excluded from the submission site boundary. A belt of trees and shrubs runs along the site boundary with Lodge Road, on the opposite site of which are detached dwellings.

The Western Part of the Site

2.6 The site’s western boundary abuts 1970s/80s residential development at Home Farm from which it is separated by a belt of mature trees. This part of the site is largely undeveloped apart from a large, single storey, flat roofed, extension, (Glan Usk Ward), which is linked to the main building by a single walkway. To the west, and south of the, Abbeyfield care facility, is a level, grassed area bounded by mature trees. A further area of sloping grassland, enclosed by dense vegetation, lies west of Abbeyfield in the north-western part of the site. Immediately to the south, and east of the residential area at Home Farm is an area of regenerated woodland.

2.7 The south-west corner of the site is occupied by unused land which is overgrown by shrubs and young trees, but not established woodland as exists to the north. A triangular, grassed area lies adjacent, separated by a row of mature Cypress trees. A road serving the Glan Usk Ward runs diagonally to the north-east, enclosed by a Beech hedge and a line of mature Beech trees on the side nearest to the older hospital buildings.

The Eastern Part of the Site

2.8 The eastern part of the site is bounded in the east by Lodge Road, beyond which is the campus of Caerleon College, now part of the University of Newport. The site has a one-way access in the south-east corner, north of the bridge where Lodge Road crosses over the railway line. Here the carriageways are of reduced width with a separate footbridge. The access road runs alongside the railway past a dwelling, the East Lodge, and a vacant church building. The continuation of the road northwards east of the main complex separates this part of the site from the older hospital buildings to the west.

2.9 Five separate sets of buildings, which vary in architectural styles, occupy this eastern segment of the site, most of which have health-related functions, including the Cardiff University School of Nursing and Midwifery, the Ty Bryn Child/Adolescent Unit, the Pollards Well Unit and the Llwyn On Unit. Between the buildings are lawned areas together with individual, and groups of, trees and parking areas.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

3.1 The policy basis for this submission derives from the content and scope of national planning guidance. It is submitted that the proposed residential development would be in accordance with national advice and guidance.

3.2 National Planning Guidance
Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) is the principal document, which sets out the land use policy context of the Welsh Assembly Government, for the consideration and evaluation of all types of development.

3.3 Planning Policy Wales confirms at Paragraph 4.1.1 that the planning system:-
3.4 This advisory document confirms that a primary principle or basic premise of the planning system is that it:-
“… must provide for an adequate and continuous supply of land, available and suitable for development to meet society’s needs. It must do this in a way that is consistent with overall sustainability principles and objectives…” (Para 1.2.2)

3.5 Planning Policy Wales promotes the notion of sustainable development as being central to all planning decisions in Wales. It defines sustainable development as:-
“…development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” (Para. 2.1.1)

3.6 Paragraph 2.1 reiterates the duty placed on the Assembly, under Section 121 of the Government of Wales Act 1998, to promote sustainable development in the exercise of its functions. The Welsh Assembly Government is promoting sustainable development planning by placing sustainability at the heart of its decision-making process, through its strategic policies, including Planning Policy Wales (March 2002).

3.7 The document outlines a number of relevant sustainable development principles, chief amongst which is the promotion of resource efficient settlement patterns and minimising land-take. There is also recognition that the location of development should aim to reduce demand for travel, especially journeys by private car.

3.8 Similarly, in terms of providing a framework for the provision of housing, one of the key policy objectives of Planning Policy Wales is to:-
“Ensure that all local communities - both urban and rural - have sufficient good quality housing for their needs...” (Para. 2.3.2)

3.9 Section 2.5 provides guidance for local authorities in achieving a sustainable settlement strategy in locating new development. It states that in their land allocation policies, local planning authorities should:-
• “Promote sustainable patterns of development
• Maintain and improve the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town, district, local and village centres
• Foster development approaches that recognise the mutual dependence between town and country, thus improving linkages between urban areas and their rural surroundings.”

3.10 Planning Policy Wales advises, in terms of the location of development in Paragraph 2.5.3, that:-
“Local planning authorities should assess the extent to which community settlement strategies and new development are consistent with minimising the need to travel and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car. A broad balance between housing and employment opportunities should be promoted to minimise the need for long distance commuting. Local authorities should adopt policies to locate major generators of travel demand such as housing, employment, retailing, leisure and recreation, and community facilities, including libraries, schools and hospitals within existing urban areas or in other locations which are, or can be, well served by public transport, or can be reached by walking or cycling”.

3.11 Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006: Housing replaces Chapter 9 of PPW and provides the framework for national housing planning policy. Paragraph 9.1.1 states that the Assembly Government will seek to provide:-
“homes that are in good condition, in safe neighbourhoods and sustainable communities; and greater choice for people over the type of housing and the location they live in.”

3.12 and to ensure that:-
• “Previously developed land is used in preference to greenfield sites;
• New housing or residential environments are well designed, environmentally sound and make a significant contribution to promoting community regeneration and improving quality of life; and that
• The overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of social and market housing that retains and, where practical, enhances important landscape and wildlife features in the development.”

3.13 Paragraph 9.2.8 states that:-
“In identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, local planning authorities should follow a search sequence, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good public transport links.”
3.14 The MIPPS in paragraph 9.2.9 goes on to state that local planning authorities should consider the following criteria in deciding which sites to allocate for housing in their development plans:-

- The availability of previously developed sites and empty or under-used buildings and their suitability for housing use;
- The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure, including public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals) to absorb further development and the cost of adding further infrastructure;
- The ability to build sustainable communities to support new physical and social infrastructure, including consideration of the effect on the Welsh Language and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities;
- Physical and environmental constraint on development of land, including for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk, taking into account that such risk may increase as a result of climate change, and the location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes; and
- Compatibility with neighbouring established land uses which might be adversely affected by encroaching residential development.

3.15 The emerging Local Development Plan will be required to review the existing planning framework provided by the UDP and to make provision for future housing needs, including those of individual settlements in accommodating necessary levels of growth to maintain communities and facilities.

3.16 The following section will seek to establish that national planning guidance is supportive of residential development taking place on the submission site, given its positive sustainable development characteristics. In these circumstances, therefore, it is submitted that these aspects should be taken into account when assessing the continued allocation of the site for residential purposes through the LDP site selection process.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The new Newport Local Development Plan (LDP) is required to place an emphasis on sustainable development, transparency in the site selection process and a robust evidence base. Newport’s current Unitary Development Plan period ends in 2011 when the new LDP period commences. In terms of housing land supply much reliance will continue to be placed on land to the east of the city, associated with the former Corus steelworks together with proposed greenfield releases around the village of Llanwern, ie the Eastern Expansion Area. Much of this land is dependant on major road linkages and there remains uncertainty over the timing of development.

4.2 Newport, has been successful in recent years in securing development on sites along the River Usk, Old Town Dock, Mon Bank Sidings and other sustainable locations where existing and proposed forms of development are contributing positively to enhancing the image of the new City.

4.3 Even though development of the St Cadocs site will not come forward until late in the Plan Period, it will be important to ensure that sites within established urban areas will continue to contribute to overall housing needs and sustainability principles as part of the future LDP strategy in order that future green field releases are minimised. It is appropriate, therefore, that the site is promoted at the current time in order to allow for redevelopment opportunities over the whole of the Plan Period, which may emerge on a phased basis, in conjunction with proposals which will enable the implementation of a number of projects designed to improve the provision of healthcare throughout the Gwent area. This is also the case with other hospital sites in the City which are also presently in use and are subject to separate submissions. These also represent future strategic opportunities for redevelopment in highly sustainable locations.

4.4 Whilst St Cadocs is partly an existing allocation in the Unitary Development Plan (H1 -46), this Section will consider the site in the context of established site selection criteria as identified in the national planning guidance described in the previous Section. An Indicative Masterplan, which is included in this submission document, provides an idea of the form of future redevelopment options.
Availability of Previously Developed Sites

4.6 The site as a whole can be described as previously developed land and is surrounded by existing development, and the railway line to the south. The Unitary Development Plan (Policy CE34) allocates 5 hectares of undeveloped land in the western part of the site for formal recreational provision which may be required by the nearby University of Wales College, Newport. The Plan states that this would form an integral part of the redevelopment proposed under Policy H1 (46).

4.7 A draft planning brief which sought to amplify these proposals was prepared in 2003 but has yet to be formally adopted. Since that time the University has not expressed an interest in acquiring the land for recreation purposes. Furthermore, the tree growth which has taken place on parts of the western sector of the site may necessitate the retention of those areas for nature conservation purposes. The remaining area of open land would not be sufficient to accommodate a full size rugby or football pitch.

4.8 It has been noted from Supplementary Planning Guidance on Outdoor Space Provision, Adopted by Newport City Council in February 2007, that a surplus of formal play provision of 0.43 hectares exists in Caerleon Ward. The Study, however, identifies a deficit of informal open space of 1.70 hectares. The redevelopment of the site with retention of appropriate landscaped areas and woodland would thus contribute to meeting the deficit of informal open space provision.

Accessibility

4.9 The site has sustainable credentials in that it is situated in close proximity to Caerleon District Centre, which has a range of services and retail outlets. A cycle path along the southern periphery of the site would link with the route along the western bank of the River Usk via Pillmawr Road, where a section is currently being constructed. This would facilitate a direct route to the City Centre. A new bridge is proposed to cross the railway line at a point near the existing pipeline crossing.

4.10 The re-opening of passenger rail facilities in this general area is proposed to serve Caerleon and the site is well-located to partially accommodate new station facilities, subject to a feasibility study as suggested in the Council prepared draft Brief. However, vehicle access and parking for new station facilities would be best accommodated to the south in order to avoid impact on the narrow road bridge at Lodge Road. Some community-related uses could, however, be considered on the submission site, close to the proposed new station.

4.11 Bus services also pass close to the site. These include Service 2D Newport – Caerleon via St Julians, 2E Newport – Caerleon via Home Farm and Trinity View, 7 Newport-Cwmbran via St Julians (7B via Caerleon Road). These operate along Lodge Road at a half-hourly frequency in each direction Monday to Saturday and 2-hourly on Sundays.

Capacity of Infrastructure

4.12 It is not anticipated that infrastructure provision presents a major obstacle to development given the existing uses on the site.

Ability to Build Communities

4.13 It is acknowledged that a sympathetically-designed scheme would be required in order to respect existing features including the retention of some buildings and landscaped grounds. These would include the frontage blocks which are good examples of the 'Arts and Crafts' movement of the early 19th Century. Existing lodge dwellings and the church are also worthy of retention. The development could include a mix of tenures and house types including an appropriate proportion of affordable housing. It is not anticipated that the development would have a negative impact on the Welsh Language.

Physical and Environmental Constraints

4.14 There are no major constraints to development subject to appropriate forms of access being achieved. The contents of the draft Brief, prepared by the Council are noted in respect of the availability of services. The existing access points present a range of options which are illustrated in the accompanying Plan. Most of the site lies in Zone A of the Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk—Development Advice Map considered to be at little or no risk of flooding. A small area in the south-western corner of the site is, however, in Zone C, where there is a major policy presumption against development. This area would need to be kept free from development. It is acknowledged that the site lies in an Archaeological Sensitive Area where investigations will be necessary.
4.15 Residential development on the site would be fully compatible with adjacent residential uses and meets accepted site selection criteria. It is, therefore, requested that favourable regard should be given to re-allocating the site for residential uses through the Local Development Plan process and incorporating other parts of the site, including land to the west and east of the existing UDP housing land allocation.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 The St Cadoc's Hospital site is being promoted at the current time in order to allow for a redevelopment opportunity which will emerge later in the Local Development Plan Period, in conjunction with proposals which will enable the implementation of a number of projects designed to improve the provision of healthcare throughout the Gwent area.

5.2 The proposed development is partly an existing residential land allocation in the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan – H1 (46). This submission is made to ensure that it remains allocated in the new emerging Local Development Plan and that additional land, previously allocated for open space purposes and land currently in health-related and education uses, is also considered for appropriate development when it becomes available during the LDP period.

5.3 A sympathetically-designed scheme would consolidate the existing settlement pattern on a site which has sustainability credentials in that it lies close to education and leisure facilities, public transport routes, and within walking distance of Caerleon District Centre and cycling distance of Newport City Centre.

5.4 Section 4 described the extent to which the proposal accords with the relevant planning policies and in doing it is possible to conclude that the site continues to represent an opportunity to provide housing at a location within the established development limits of Caerleon.

5.5 In the light of all the aforementioned circumstances, it is considered that the proposed residential development at this location would be in accordance with national advice and guidance and also accords with accepted site selection criteria.

5.6 Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that in assessing Candidate Site Submissions in the emerging Newport Local Development Plan, the site in question continues to be identified as a housing land allocation with additional land within the grounds also included as a residential allocation.

Asbri Planning Ltd
October 2008

Question: 9 Map Included?

Yes.
Candidate Site on Royal Gwent Hospital site for residential-led mix of uses including retail and employment.

Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response:
It should be ensured that walking and cycling facilities are created and integrated into the surrounding area to reduce the need to travel by private car to services and facilities including employment.
As the site is next to Conservation Areas, the tourism potential of the site should be explored - facilities provided should seek to address any potential.
Although not in a flood zone, and increase in hard surfacing should ensure that net surface water runoff is unchanged.
It should be ensured that the potential for the creation of green infrastructure is realised.
Mitigation measures to prevent negative effects on the archaeologically sensitive area designation should be investigated and implantation ensured ahead of development.

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response:
The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Stow Hill. The site is not recommended for inclusion with the Local Development Plan given the uncertainty over the timing of the release of the land and deliverability within the plan period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>SA Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>It should be ensured that walking and cycling facilities are created and integrated into the surrounding area to reduce the need to travel by private car to services and facilities including employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the site is next to Conservation Areas, the tourism potential of the site should be explored - facilities provided should seek to address any potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although not in a flood zone, and increase in hard surfacing should ensure that net surface water runoff is unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It should be ensured that the potential for the creation of green infrastructure is realised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation measures to prevent negative effects on the archaeologically sensitive area designation should be investigated and implantation ensured ahead of development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Overall Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Stow Hill. The site is not recommended for inclusion with the Local Development Plan given the uncertainty over the timing of the release of the land and deliverability within the plan period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.1</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Royal Gwent Hospital Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.2</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>North of Cardiff Road, Newport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.3</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>ST 309 872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>ST 309 872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.4</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>8 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>7.63ha.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.5</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Hospital Site on south-facing slope in inner-city location on main route corridor (A48) with Belle Vue Park to west and Clytha Park Conservation Area to east.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.6</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Hospital with ancillary office and teaching uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.7</th>
<th>Proposed Use(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Residential-led mix of uses including retail and employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

*Representation Text: Yes.*

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

*Representation Text:*

- The site is part of the urban fabric of the area and is heavily developed with multi-storey hospital ward blocks.
- Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Council Response:**

- Countryside comments: SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

*Representation Text: Yes.*

- Mature trees along Cardiff Road frontage only.
- TPO on Sycamore.
- TPO 2/1999 and additional TPO potential.

**Council Response:**

- TPO on Sycamore.
- TPO 2/1999 and additional TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

*Representation Text:*

- Additional open space could be created as a result of a residential scheme.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

*Representation Text:*

- As above.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

*Representation Text: Yes.*

- Close to original medieval ‘core’ of Newport which includes town centre and St Woolos area.
- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area includes The Friars (a grade II listed building, reputedly the site of a medieval Friary).
- Restrains: May require desk-based assessment prior to planning permission being granted. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Council Response:**

- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area includes The Friars (a grade II listed building, reputedly the site of a medieval Friary). Restrains: May require desk-based assessment prior to planning permission being granted. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

*Representation Text: No.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site on Royal Gwent Hospital site for residential-led mix of uses including retail and employment.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Includes Listed Building - The Friary, and part of the site in its eastern section is within a conservation area.

- **Council Response:** Listed Building is The Friars.
  - Listed building (2 listed buildings)
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park (adjacent to belle vue park)
  - conservation area (adjacent to)

  Within Newport boundary

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

- **Council Response:** Yes. Potentially yes subject to transport assesment. Various accesses.

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

- **Council Response:** Links via footways and road crossings already in place.
  - The proposed development falls within the Stow Hill Ward that has a shortfall in Formal Play of 6.56Ha and Equipped Play of 0.92Ha. The surrounding area is heavily urbanised except for...
the adjacent Belle Vue Park that serves both a local and City wide function. Owing to the size of this proposed development it would require a LEAP provision to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development. In addition off-site contribution for the upgrading of formal play space at Belle Vue Park and or Pillgwenlly Playing Fields would also be required.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

*Representation Text:* Bus routes already accessible at short distance from site.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

*Representation Text:* Numerous bus services along Cardiff Road.

*Council Response:* Cardiff Road- Adjacent to site.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

*Representation Text:* Half hourly

*Council Response:* >10 Minute frequency

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

*Representation Text:* Newport Station - 1.2 kilometres.

*Council Response:* Newport 1.3Km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

*Representation Text:* Edge of city centre - 350 metres.

*Council Response:* City Centre- 200m from site boundary.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

*Representation Text:* Central city location.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

*Representation Text:* Proximity to facilities / job opportunities.

*Council Response:* Links to existing infrastructure. Development to provide internal facilities.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site on Royal Gwent Hospital site for residential-led mix of uses including retail and employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Pillgwenlly primary school (500m to south).

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:** Mixed form of uses - improved opportunities for affordable housing, employment and retail facilities.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:** Services already serving existing development.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development for sites 155.C2 and 155.C3. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

For sites 1631.C1, 1631.C2, 1631.C3, 1631.C4, 1631.C5 and 1631.C6 it is unlikely that we will have any objections to their inclusion within the development plan.

**Water supply**
It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: Central area location.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text: Development of site would not set precedent for reasons above.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

Representation Text: Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>7.5 Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td>Yes. Latter part of plan period when replaced by new hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>7.9 Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

16/02/2012

**Summary:** Candidate Site on Royal Gwent Hospital site for residential-led mix of uses including retail and employment.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of Gwent Health Care NHS Trust who are the landowners of the site concerned. The site consists of the current hospital complex, which will come forward for redevelopment at some stage during the Local Development Plan period which will extend up to 2026.

1.2 This submission is, therefore, made in order that the land is considered in the new plan as a major mixed use development opportunity incorporating residential, employment and retail uses.

1.3 It is acknowledged, however, that the site has particular characteristics and lies adjacent to Conservation Areas at Clytha Square and Belle Vue Park. A sympathetic form of development will, therefore, be appropriate which will integrate into the existing urban form whilst making the best use of the land resource in a highly sustainable location at a key ‘gateway’ site close to the City Centre.

1.4 This submission, therefore, in promoting the site for mixed use forms of development, will provide a description of the site at Section 2, review the planning policies relevant to the site at Section 3, provide an appraisal of the development at Section 4 and will draw together the key points and conclusions at Section 5.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The submission site extends over 8 hectares in area. The红线line plan in Appendix 1 clearly shows the configuration of buildings on the site. It lies north of the A48, Cardiff Road some 500 metres south-west of Newport City Centre. The site occupies a south facing slope, with a moderate gradient from south-east to north-west. To the west the site boundary runs along Belle Vue Lane, beyond a 3-metre high retaining wall along the western side of the road lies Belle Vue Park. Otherwise, the immediate area is predominantly residential in character, including Clytha Square to the east which has some office uses.

2.2 The eastern portion of the site is dominated by the main hospital ward blocks C and D which rise to seven storeys. The main access to the site, off Cardiff Road, lies near the eastern corner. This serves the Accident and Emergency Unit and main entrance together with car parking areas between the hospital frontage and Cardiff Road. Vacant single-storey buildings lie east of the entrance adjacent to a hospital service bus stop. Further to the east a row of three vacant, 3-storey dwellings (Nos 62 to 66 Cardiff Road) lie on the Cardiff Road frontage.

2.3 Directly adjacent to the entrance of D and C Blocks are temporary portakabin offices. On the opposite side of the road, which serves ambulances and hospital vehicles and leads to the Sterilisation Disinfection Unit to the north, are buildings which house the Richmond House Diabetic Centre and the Cordell Centre.

2.4 To the south and west of C and D blocks, buildings extend closer to Cardiff Road and comprise a mix of styles which date from original Edwardian structures to more recent buildings and extensions. Directly to the rear, B Block rises to 6 floors. This grouping of buildings includes the Ante Natal Clinic, Maternity and Gynaecology, Oral Surgery/Orthodontics, Fracture/Orthopaedia and Physiotherapy.

2.5 The Belle Vue entrance, off Belle Vue Lane, provides a direct access to wards on B Block. E Block, a newer 3-storey building, housing the Eye and Ear, Nose and Throat departments, lies directly to the north of this entrance. North of E Block is an area of staff car parking, beyond which lie a series of 3-storey, flat roofed blocks accessed either directly off Friars Lane or Friars Field, a road which serves a large part of the site from the north. Uses in the north-western part of the site include nurses’ accommodation, the Pathology Department and administration offices. South of the junction of Friars Field with Friars Lane is a prominent gabled, 19th Century building, Friars House or ‘The Friary’, constructed of Cotswold Stone which houses the Postgraduate Institute and is a Grade II Listed Building.
3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

3.1 The policy basis for this submission derives from the content and scope of national planning guidance. It is submitted that the proposed mixed-use development would be in accordance with national advice and guidance.

3.2 National Planning Guidance

Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) is the principal document, which sets out the land use policy context of the Welsh Assembly Government, for the consideration and evaluation of all types of development.

3.3 Planning Policy Wales confirms at Paragraph 4.1.1 that the planning system is intended to help protect the amenity and environment of towns, cities and the countryside in the public interest while promoting high quality, sustainable development.

3.4 This advisory document confirms that a primary principle or basic premise of the planning system is that it must provide for an adequate and continuous supply of land, available and suitable for development to meet society's needs. It must do this in a way that is consistent with overall sustainability principles and objectives (Para 1.2.2).

3.5 Planning Policy Wales promotes the notion of sustainable development as being central to all planning decisions in Wales. It defines sustainable development as: development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. (Para. 2.1.1)

3.6 Paragraph 2.1 reiterates the duty placed on the Assembly, under Section 121 of the Government of Wales Act 1998, to promote sustainable development in the exercise of its functions. The Welsh Assembly Government is promoting sustainable development planning by placing sustainability at the heart of its decision-making process, through its strategic policies, including Planning Policy Wales (March 2002).

3.7 The document outlines a number of relevant sustainable development principles, chief amongst which is the promotion of resource efficient settlement patterns and minimising landtake. There is also recognition that the location of development should aim to reduce demand for travel, especially journeys by private car.

3.8 Similarly, in terms of providing a framework for the provision of housing, one of the key policy objectives of Planning Policy Wales is to: ensure that all local communities - both urban and rural - have sufficient good quality housing for their needs. (Para. 2.3.2)

3.9 Section 2.5 provides guidance for local authorities in achieving a sustainable settlement strategy in locating new development. It states that in their land allocation policies, local planning authorities should:

• Promote sustainable patterns of development
• Maintain and improve the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town, district, local and village centres
• Foster development approaches that recognise the mutual dependence between town and country, thus improving linkages between urban areas and their rural surroundings

3.10 Planning Policy Wales advises, in terms of the location of development in Paragraph 2.5.3, that:

"Local planning authorities should assess the extent to which community settlement strategies and new development are consistent with minimising the need to travel and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car. A broad balance between housing and employment opportunities should be promoted to minimise the need for long distance commuting. Local authorities should adopt policies to locate major generators of travel demand such as housing, employment, retailing, leisure and recreation, and community facilities, including libraries, schools and hospitals within existing urban areas or in other locations which are, or can be, well served by public transport, or can be reached by walking or cycling".

3.11 PPW states in Section 7 – Supporting the Economy, that in designating land for employment needs, local planning authorities should address such issues as the phasing of development. Mixed-use development should be promoted in, and adjoining, existing settlements, where appropriate. Policies and supplementary guidance should support mixed-use
3.12 Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006 replaces Chapter 9 of PPW and provides the framework for national housing planning policy. Paragraph 9.1.1 states that the Assembly Government will seek to provide:

"homes that are in good condition, in safe neighbourhoods and sustainable communities; and greater choice for people over the type of housing and the location they live in."

3.13 and to ensure that:

- Previously developed land is used in preference to greenfield sites;
- New housing or residential environments are well designed, environmentally sound and make a significant contribution to promoting community regeneration and improving quality of life; and that
- The overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of social and market housing that retains and, where practical, enhances important landscape and wildlife features in the development."

3.14 Paragraph 9.2.8 states that:

"In identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, local planning authorities should follow a search sequence, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good public transport links."

3.15 The MIPPS in paragraph 9.2.9 goes on to state that local planning authorities should consider the following criteria in deciding which sites to allocate for housing in their development plans:

- The availability of previously developed sites and empty or under used buildings and their suitability for housing use;
- The location and accessibility of potential development sites to jobs, shops and services to modes other than the car, and the potential for improving such sustainability;
- The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure, including public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals) to absorb further development and the cost of adding further infrastructure;
- The ability to build sustainable communities to support new physical and social infrastructure, including consideration of the effect on the Welsh Language and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities;
- Physical and environmental constraint on development of land, including for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk, taking into account that such risk may increase as a result of climate change, and the location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes; and
- Compatibility with neighbouring established land uses which might be adversely affected by encroaching residential development.

3.16A Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement (MIPPS) on Retailing and Town Centres was published in 2005 and updates Planning Policy Wales. It provides the framework for national retail planning policy. The MIPPS indicates that the strategic objectives of policy are:

- to secure accessible, efficient, competitive and innovative retail provision;
- To promote established town, district, local and village centres as the most appropriate locations for retailing;
- To enhance the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town, district and village centres; and
- To promote access to these centres by public transport, walking and cycling."

3.17 The MIPPS encourages retail provision to be located in proximity to other commercial businesses, facilities for leisure, community facilities and centres of employment. In assessing applications the following should be considered:

- Compatibility with any community or up to date Development Plan strategy;
- Consideration of the need for the development/extension unless the proposal is for a site within a defined centre or one allocated in an up to date development plan;
- The sequential approach to site selection;
- The impact on existing centres;
- If redevelopment is involved whether it involves a net gain in floorspace and whether or not it is like for like in terms of comparison or convenience;
- The rate of take up of allocations in any adopted development plan;
3.18 The MIPPS acknowledges that some types of retailing such as stores selling bulky goods and requiring large showrooms may not be able to find suitable sites in town centres.

3.19 The emerging Local Development Plan will be required to review the existing planning framework provided by the UDP and to make provision for future housing, employment and retail needs.

3.20 The following section will seek to establish that national planning guidance is supportive of mixed use forms of development taking place on the submission site, given its positive sustainable development characteristics. In these circumstances, therefore, it is submitted that these aspects should be taken into account when assessing the allocation of the site for appropriate uses through the LDP site selection process.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The new Newport Local Development Plan (LDP) is required to place an emphasis on sustainable development, transparency in the site selection process and a robust evidence base. Newport’s current Unitary Development Plan period ends in 2011 when the new LDP period commences. In terms of housing land supply, much reliance will continue to be placed on land to the east of the city, associated with the former Corus steelworks together with proposed greenfield releases around the village of Llanwern, ie the Eastern Expansion Area. Much of this land is reliant on major road linkages and there remains uncertainty over the timing of development.

4.2 Newport, has been successful in recent years in securing development on sites along the River Usk, Old Town Dock, Mon Bank Sidings and other sustainable locations where existing and proposed forms of development are contributing positively to enhancing the image of the new City. Current proposals include the siting of a new Local General Hospital which will replace the Royal Gwent and St Woolos facilities at the former Whiteheads Steel Plant, which is within 200 metres of the existing hospital.

4.3 Even though development of the Royal Gwent Hospital Site will not come forward until late in the Plan Period, it will be important to ensure that sites within established urban areas will continue to contribute to overall development needs and sustainability principles as part of the future LDP strategy in order that future greenfield releases are minimised. It is appropriate, therefore, that the site is promoted at the current time in order to allow for redevelopment opportunities over the whole of the Plan Period, which may emerge on a phased basis, in conjunction with proposals which will enable the implementation of a number of projects designed to improve the provision of healthcare throughout the Gwent area. This is also the case with other hospital sites in the City which are also presently in use but are being promoted as future strategic opportunities for redevelopment in sustainable locations.

4.4 The site is not currently allocated for any particular use in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. This Section will consider the site in the context of established site selection criteria for housing development (as identified in the previous Section) and will also examine the site’s potential in relation to the accommodation of other potential uses.

Consideration of the Site Against Established Site Selection Criteria

4.5 Planning Policy Wales and the Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/06 provide criteria for the identification of housing allocation sites as follows:-

- The availability of previously developed sites and buildings
- Accessibility to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car;
- The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure;
- The ability to build communities;
- Physical and environmental constraints;
- Compatibility with neighbouring land uses.

Availability of Previously Developed Sites
4.6 The site is intensely developed land in an inner urban context surrounded by buildings of varying scales together with an important open space. It clearly meets the definition of previously-used land.

Accessibility
4.7 The site has sustainable credentials in that it is situated in close proximity to Newport City Centre, which is a sub-regional shopping centre with a wide range of services and retail outlets. Shops and services also extend to Cardiff Road and Commercial Road, in closer proximity to the site.

4.8 Bus services also pass along Cardiff Road where there is a dedicated bus lane and bus stops close to the site boundary. The services include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Operator</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Frequency (Mon to Sat)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34/35 (Newport Transport)</td>
<td>Newport - Duffryn</td>
<td>Half Hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 (Newport Transport)</td>
<td>Newport – Celtic Springs</td>
<td>Half Hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32/33 (Newport Transport)</td>
<td>Newport - Rhiwderin</td>
<td>Half Hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 (Newport Transport)</td>
<td>Newport - Marshfield</td>
<td>Half Hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (Newport/Cardiff Transport)</td>
<td>Newport - Cardiff15 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X15 (Stagecoach)</td>
<td>Newport – Brynmawr-Abertillery</td>
<td>Half hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X18</td>
<td>Newport - Ebbw Vale-Newbridge</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity of Infrastructure
4.9 It is not anticipated that infrastructure provision presents a major obstacle to development due to the existing use and nature of the site. Some consideration may have to be given to improvements to the carriageway and junctions along Friars Lane which experiences some congestion at peak hours.

Ability to Build Communities
4.10 It is acknowledged that a sympathetically-designed scheme would be required. The mix of uses would contribute to the creation of an integrated community and would include residential forms of development with a range of tenures and house types including an appropriate proportion of affordable housing.

Physical and Environmental Constraints
4.11 The main physical constraint relates to the topography of the site, where existing buildings have been designed or extended with the requirement to address the topography of parts of the site and this will need consideration in the site’s redevelopment, possibly by retaining land as open space where there is a pronounced change in levels. Much consideration will also have to be given to the scale, massing and design of buildings in order that they do not impact on the setting of adjacent Conservation Areas at Clytha Square and Belle Vue Park. Peripheral landscaping will be necessary. Older buildings on the site, including the former dwellings at the frontage of Cardiff Road, which is within the Conservation area, and Friars House, a Grade 2 Listed Building, will require retention.

Compatibility with neighbouring, established uses
4.12 Mixed-use residential, office and appropriate forms of retail and commercial development on the site would be fully compatible with adjacent residential uses. In central parts of the site, currently occupied by buildings of 6 to 7 storeys, a high-density solution may be appropriate. Education, recreation and any need to retain health-related uses could also be considered in a future redevelopment scheme. The scope for retail and employment uses is discussed below.

Potential Retail Uses
4.13 The emerging Local Development Plan will be required to review the existing planning framework provided by the UDP and to make provision for the future retail needs of the City. Additional spending as a result of population growth and changes in retail trends and requirements will also need to be provided for.

4.14 The need for additional retail floorspace, including both quantitative need and qualitative need, will, therefore, be identified during the Plan period. The site is well placed to accommodate such needs in sequential terms, lying as it is in a central part of the city. It is also close to public transport routes. It is acknowledged, however, that foodstores, various specialised forms of retailing, and showroom uses which do not directly compete with the City Centre, are likely to be more appropriate and will be accommodated close to the Cardiff
Road frontage.

Employment

4.15 Employment uses on the site would add to the sustainability credentials of the development. Demand will continue during the LDP period for B1 office accommodation and the site is well placed to meet this. The Indicative Plan attached shows commercial forms of development along the Cardiff Road frontage which could include a combination of retail and employment uses.

4.16 The site, therefore, meets accepted site selection criteria and it is, therefore, requested that favourable regard should be given to allocating the site for a mix of uses through the Local Development Plan process.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 The Royal Gwent Hospital site is being promoted at the current time in order to allow for a redevelopment opportunity which will emerge later in the Local Development Plan Period, in conjunction with proposals which will enable the implementation of a number of projects designed to improve the provision of healthcare throughout the Gwent area.

5.2 Although it is acknowledged that the site will remain in use for hospital and health uses for the foreseeable future until alternative modern purpose-built replacement facilities are constructed, this submission is made to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to the site’s potential in the emerging Local Development Plan.

5.3 A sympathetically-designed, landmark scheme would be appropriate at such a location on a key ‘gateway’ site in the City. In this context, however, the setting of adjacent Conservation Areas will need to be respected.

5.4 Section 4 described the extent to which the proposal accords with the relevant planning policies and in doing it is possible to conclude that the Royal Gwent Hospital Site represents an opportunity to provide a mixed form of development at a central location close to Newport City Centre.

5.5 In the light of all the aforementioned circumstances, it is considered that the proposed mixed use development at this location would be in accordance with national advice and guidance and also accords with accepted site selection criteria.

5.6 Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that in assessing Candidate Site Submissions in the emerging Newport Local Development Plan, the site in question is identified as a mixed use development allocation.

Asbri Planning Ltd
October 2008

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C2</td>
<td>06/05/09</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site on Royal Gwent Hospital site for residential-led mix of uses including retail and employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C3</td>
<td>06/05/09</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential with some Community uses on St Woolos Hospital site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: 61/ St Woolos Hospital New Site
### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

- It should be ensured that walking and cycling facilities are created and integrated into the surrounding area to reduce the need to travel by private car to services and facilities including employment.
- As the site is next to Conservation Areas, the tourism potential of the site should be explored—facilities provided should seek to address any potential.
- Although not in a flood zone, an increase in hard surfacing should ensure that net surface water runoff is unchanged.
- It should be ensured that the potential for the creation of green infrastructure is realised.
- Mitigation measures to prevent negative effects on the archaeologically sensitive area designation should be investigated and implantation ensured ahead of development.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Stow Hill. The site is not recommended for inclusion with the Local Development Plan given the uncertainty over the timing of the release of the land and deliverability within the plan period.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:**

- St Woolos Hospital Site

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:**

- South of Stow Hill, Newport

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**

- ST 306 874
- 330599 181442

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:**

- 3.5 hectares
- 3.82ha.

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:**

- Hospital Site on south-facing slope in inner-city location in predominantly residential area west of Newport City Centre.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:**

- Hospital with ancillary office and day centre uses.

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:**

- Residential with some community uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Poly</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Residential with some Community uses on St Woolos Hospital site.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** The site is part of the urban fabric of the area and is heavily developed with buildings dating from various periods.
- **Council Response:** Countryside Comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** TPOs on:
  - Lawsons Cypress
  - Pine
  - Limes (3)
  - Tulip
  - Cypress
  - Golden Cypress
  - Horse Chestnut (2)

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- **Representation Text:** Additional open space could be created as a result of a residential scheme.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** As above.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Close to original medieval 'core' of Newport which includes St Woolos area.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Area of potential medieval settlement around the site of the original Newport Castle. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential with some Community uses on St Woolos Hospital site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
**Representation Text:** Yes. Stow Hill Conservation Area boundary to west.
**Council Response:**
- Listed building (2 listed buildings)
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area (adjacent to)
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
**Representation Text:** Yes.
**Council Response:** Yes- Stow Hill. Yes - Subject to access design. Visibility Splays. Transport assessment required.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
**16/02/2012**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:** Links already in place via gap in residential properties to south.

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Stow Hill Ward that has a shortfall in Formal Play of 6.56Ha and Equipped Play of 0.92Ha. The site's proximity to Belle Vue Park and Clifton Park means that a request for an off-site contribution to upgrade local facilities would be requested.

**Question:** 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:** Bus routes already accessible adjacent to site.

**Council Response:** Bus routes already accessible adjacent to site.

**Question:** 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:** Numerous bus services along Stow Hill.

**Council Response:** Stow Hill, Site frontage.

**Question:** 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:** Half hourly.

**Council Response:** <10 Min Frequency

**Question:** 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:** Newport Station - 1.0 kilometres

**Council Response:** Newport 1.1Km

**Question:** 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:** Stow Hill local centre - adjacent to site.

**Council Response:** Stow Hill Garage - 30m edge of site. Clifton Place shops - 100m. City Centre - 700m.

**Question:** 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:** Central city location.

**Question:** 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

**Representation Text:** Proximity to facilities/job opportunities.

**Council Response:** Proximity to facilities/job opportunities.

**Question:** 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 4.9 Open Space?
Representation Text: Candidate Site for Residential with some Community uses on St Woolos Hospital site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Schools?</td>
<td>Yes. Gaer and Pillgwenlly primary schools (750m to west and south respectively). Pill PS 1km to south, Gaer PS 1.3km to west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Community Engagement?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Community Aspirations?</td>
<td>Mixed form of uses - improved opportunities for affordable housing, and community facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?</td>
<td>Services already serving existing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?</td>
<td>Yes. Welsh Water Comments: Sewerage From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development for sites 155.C2 and 155.C3. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately. Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system. For sites 1631.C1, 1631.C2, 1631.C3, 1631.C4, 1631.C5 and 1631.C6 it is unlikely that we will have any objections to their inclusion within the development plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential with some Community uses on St Woolos Hospital site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements beign undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prioir to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.4</th>
<th>Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.5</th>
<th>Logical Extension?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Central area location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.6</th>
<th>Precedent Setting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Development of site would not set precedent for reasons above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.1</th>
<th>Site Owned by Proposer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.2</th>
<th>Site Owner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/02/2012</td>
<td>16/02/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?
**Representation Text:** Yes. Latter part of plan period when replaced by new hospital.

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 8 Other Information?
**Representation Text:** See previous submission document (Major Candidate Site):

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of Gwent Healthcare NHS Trust who are the landowners of the site concerned. The site consists of the current hospital buildings. The land will come forward for redevelopment at some stage during the Local Development Plan period which will extend up to 2026.

1.2 This submission is, therefore, made in order that the land is considered in the new plan as a major mixed use development opportunity incorporating residential, employment and retail uses.

1.3 It is acknowledged, however, that the site has particular characteristics and lies adjacent to the Conservation Areas at Stow Park Circle and Stow Hill. A sympathetic form of development will, therefore, be appropriate which will integrate into the existing urban form whilst making the best use of the land resource in a highly sustainable location at an accessible site close to the City Centre.

1.4 This submission in promoting the site for mixed use forms of development will provide a description of the site at Section 2, review the planning policies relevant to the site at Section...
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The submission site lies south of Stow Hill some 750 metres west of Newport City Centre. The site occupies relatively level 'plateau' areas with a change in levels between the original part of the hospital and the 'Springfield' block to the south, which lies at a lower level and is connected via a pedestrian overpass. The site has two access points, directly off Stow Hill, and via a gap between residential properties on Friars Road. Surrounding uses are mainly residential in character, with some commercial properties along Stow Hill, including a petrol filling station and shop opposite the site. There is a small local shopping centre at the junction of Stow Hill and Friars Road within 200 metres of the east of the site, near St Woolos Cathedral.

2.2 The site extends over 3.5 hectares in area and comprises a cluster of buildings dating from various periods. A stone wall runs along the boundary with Stow Hill. The main access lies at the eastern end of this frontage. The buildings along Stow Hill are set back beyond a road which provides vehicular access to the various units which have very limited car parking provision. A date above the entrance to one of the buildings off Stow Hill is given as '1902'. These are mainly two-storey buildings with modern single-storey extensions, including the Outpatients entrance, and pre-fabricated buildings. A chapel building also occupies part of this frontage.

2.3 At the western and eastern ends of the site are larger 3 storey blocks. It is believed that some buildings are of an earlier construction than the date referred to above, but many have been substantially altered. To the east a roadway links the main entrance to the access point off Friars Road. In the south-eastern part of the site is an incinerator block with a tall chimney. The southern access to the site lies opposite Belle Vue Park and mainly serves the large, 3-storey Springfield Day Centre which lies at a lower level and occupies the southern portion of the site. A car parking area lies immediately to the west of Springfield.

2.4 Functions associated with the St Woolos Hospital site include Dermatology, a Chest Clinic, Occupational Health, Neurophysiology, Lymphodoema, Clinical Trials, an Orthopaedical Surgery Unit and Renal Unit.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

3.1 The policy basis for this submission derives from the content and scope of national planning guidance. It is submitted that the proposed mixed-use development would be in accordance with national advice and guidance.

3.2 National Planning Guidance

Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) is the principal document, which sets out the land use policy context of the Welsh Assembly Government, for the consideration and evaluation of all types of development.

3.3 Planning Policy Wales confirms at Paragraph 4.1.1 that the planning system:-
"...is intended to help protect the amenity and environment of towns, cities and the countryside in the public interest while promoting high quality, sustainable development."

3.4 This advisory document confirms that a primary principle or basic premise of the planning system is that it:-
"...must provide for an adequate and continuous supply of land, available and suitable for development to meet society's needs. It must do this in a way that is consistent with overall sustainability principles and objectives..." (Para 1.2.2)

3.5 Planning Policy Wales promotes the notion of sustainable development as being central to all planning decisions in Wales. It defines sustainable development as:-
"...development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." (Para. 2.1.1)

3.6 Paragraph 2.1 reiterates the duty placed on the Assembly, under Section 121 of the Government of Wales Act 1998, to promote sustainable development in the exercise of its functions. The Welsh Assembly Government is promoting sustainable development planning by placing sustainability at the heart of its decision-making process, through its strategic
3.7 The document outlines a number of relevant sustainable development principles, chief amongst which is the promotion of resource efficient settlement patterns and minimising land-take. There is also recognition that the location of development should aim to reduce demand for travel, especially journeys by private car.

3.8 Similarly, in terms of providing a framework for the provision of housing, one of the key policy objectives of Planning Policy Wales is to:-

"Ensure that all local communities - both urban and rural - have sufficient good quality housing for their needs..." (Para. 2.3.2)

3.9 Section 2.5 provides guidance for local authorities in achieving a sustainable settlement strategy in locating new development. It states that in their land allocation policies, local planning authorities should:

- Promote sustainable patterns of development
- Maintain and improve the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town, district, local and village centres
- Foster development approaches that recognise the mutual dependence between town and country, thus improving linkages between urban areas and their rural surroundings.

3.10 Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) advises, in terms of the location of development in Paragraph 2.5.3, that:-

"Local planning authorities should assess the extent to which community settlement strategies and new development are consistent with minimising the need to travel and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car. A broad balance between housing and employment opportunities should be promoted to minimise the need for long distance commuting. Local authorities should adopt policies to locate major generators of travel demand such as housing, employment, retailing, leisure and recreation, and community facilities, including libraries, schools and hospitals within existing urban areas or in other locations which are, or can be, well served by public transport, or can be reached by walking or cycling."

3.11 PPW states in Section 7 – Supporting the Economy, that in designating land for employment needs, local planning authorities should address such issues as the phasing of development. Mixed-use development should be promoted in, and adjoining, existing settlements, where appropriate. Policies and supplementary guidance should support mixed-use developments, including flexible workplace/dwellings and commercial premises, where these are appropriate.

3.12 Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006 replaces Chapter 9 of PPW and provides the framework for national housing planning policy. Paragraph 9.1.1 states that the Assembly Government will seek to provide:-

"homes that are in good condition, in safe neighbourhoods and sustainable communities; and greater choice for people over the type of housing and the location they live in."

3.13 and to ensure that:-

- Previously developed land is used in preference to greenfield sites;
- New housing or residential environments are well designed, environmentally sound and make a significant contribution to promoting community regeneration and improving quality of life; and that
- The overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of social and market housing that retains and, where practical, enhances important landscape and wildlife features in the development."

3.14 Paragraph 9.2.8 states that:-

"In identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, local planning authorities should follow a search sequence, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good public transport links."

3.15 The MIPPS in paragraph 9.2.9 goes on to state that local planning authorities should consider the following criteria in deciding which sites to allocate for housing in their development plans:-

- The availability of previously developed sites and empty or under used buildings and their suitability for housing use;
- The location and accessibility of potential development sites to jobs, shops and services to modes other than the car, and the potential for improving such sustainability;
- The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure, including public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals) to absorb further development and the cost of adding further infrastructure;
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• The ability to build sustainable communities and support new physical and social infrastructure, including consideration of the effect on the Welsh Language and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities;
• Physical and environmental constraint on development of land, including for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk, taking into account that such risk may increase as a result of climate change, and the location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes; and
• Compatibility with neighbouring established land uses which might be adversely affected by encroaching residential development.

3.16A Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement (MIPPS) on Retailing and Town Centres was published in 2005 and updates Planning Policy Wales and provides the framework for national retail planning policy. The MIPPS indicates that the strategic objectives of policy are:

• to secure accessible, efficient, competitive and innovative retail provision;
• To promote established town, district, local and village centres as the most appropriate locations for retailing;
• To enhance the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town, district, and village centres and
• To promote access to these centres by public transport, walking and cycling.*

3.17The MIPPS encourages retail provision to be located in proximity to other commercial businesses, facilities for leisure, community facilities and centres of employment. In assessing applications the following should be considered:

• compatibility with any community or up to date Development Plan strategy;
• Consideration of the need for the development/extension unless the proposal is for a site within a defined centre or one allocated in an up to date development plan;
• The sequential approach to site selection;
• The impact on existing centres;
• if redevelopment is involved whether it involves a net gain in floorspace and whether or not it is like for like in terms of comparison or convenience;
• the rate of take up of allocations in any adopted development plan;
• accessibility by a variety of modes of travel;
• any improvements to public transport;
• the impact on overall travel patterns; and
• the best use of land close to any transport hub in terms of density and mixed use.*

3.18The MIPPS acknowledges that some types of retailing such as stores selling bulky goods and requiring large showrooms may not be able to find suitable sites in town centres.

3.19The emerging Local Development Plan will be required to review the existing planning framework provided by the UDP and to make provision for future housing, employment and retail needs.

3.20The following section will seek to establish that national planning guidance is supportive of mixed use development taking place on the submission site, given its positive sustainable development characteristics. In these circumstances, therefore, it is submitted that these aspects should be taken into account when assessing the site through the LDP site selection process.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The new Newport Local Development Plan (LDP) is required to place an emphasis on sustainable development, transparency in the site selection process and a robust evidence base. Newport’s current Unitary Development Plan period ends in 2011 when the new LDP period commences. In terms of housing land supply much reliance will continue to be placed...
4.2 Newport, has been successful in recent years in securing development on sites along the River Usk, Old Town Dock, Mon Bank Sidings and other sustainable locations where existing and proposed forms of development are contributing positively to enhancing the image of the new City. Current proposals include the siting of a new Local General Hospital, which will partly replace the St Woolos and Royal Gwent facilities, at the former Whiteheads Steel Plant, which is within 300 metres of the existing hospitals.

4.3 Even though development of the St Woolos Hospital Site will not come forward until later in the Plan Period, it will be important to ensure that sites within established urban areas will continue to contribute to overall development needs and sustainability principles as part of the future LDP strategy in order that future green field releases are minimised. It is appropriate, therefore, that the site is promoted at current time in order to allow for redevelopment opportunities over the whole of the Plan Period, which may emerge on a phased basis, in conjunction with proposals which will enable the implementation of a number of projects designed to improve the provision of healthcare throughout the Gwent area. This is also the case with other hospital sites in the City which are also presently in use but are being promoted as future strategic opportunities for redevelopment in sustainable locations.

4.4 The site is not currently allocated for any particular use in the adopted Unitary Development Plan; this Section will consider the site in the context of established site selection criteria for housing development (as identified in the previous Section) and will also examine the site’s potential in relation to the accommodation of other potential uses.

Consideration of the Site Against Established Site Selection Criteria

4.5 Planning Policy Wales and the Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/06 provide criteria for the identification of housing allocation sites as follows:

The availability of previously developed sites and buildings
Accessibility to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car;
The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure;
The ability to build communities;
Physical and environmental constraints;
Compatibility with neighbouring land uses.

Availability of Previously Developed Sites

4.6 The site is intensely developed land in an inner urban context. It, therefore, clearly meets the definition of previously used land.

Accessibility

4.7 The site has sustainable credentials in that it is situated in close proximity to Newport City Centre, which is a sub regional shopping centre with a wide range of services and retail outlets. Shops and services also extend along Stow Hill, in closer proximity to the site. Newport railway station lies some 750 metres to the north.

4.8 Bus services also pass along Stow Hill and include:

Service Destination Frequency
1 (Newport Transport) Newport to Rogerstone 45 minute Mon to Sat, hourly Sundays
11 (Newport Transport) Newport to GaerHall hourly Mon to Sat, hourly Sun
50 (Stagecoach) Newport – Bargoed via Caerphilly Half hourly Mon to Sat, hourly Sun
56 (Stagecoach) Newport – Tredagar - Blackwood Half hourly Mon to Sat, hourly Sun
151 (Stagecoach) Newport – Risca – Ty Sign45 minute Mon to Sat, hourly Sundays

Capacity of Infrastructure

4.9 It is not anticipated that infrastructure provision presents a major obstacle to development due to the existing use and nature of the site. An improved access will be required off Stow Hill. The Friars Road access may be best retained as a pedestrian/cycle route to provide a link through the site to Belle Vue Park. This is illustrated in the accompanying Indicative Plan.

Ability to Build Communities

4.10 It is acknowledged that a sympathetically-designed scheme would be required. The mix of uses would contribute to the creation of an integrated community and would include...
residential forms of development with a range of tenures and house types including an appropriate proportion of affordable housing.

Physical and Environmental Constraints

4.11 The site has no major physical constraints. Much consideration will, however, need to be given to the scale, massing and design of buildings in order that they do not impact on the setting of adjacent Conservation Areas at Stow Park Circle, the eastern boundary of which runs directly along the western boundary of the submission site, and the Stow Hill Conservation Area to the east. Appropriate buffer planting will be necessary as indicated on the accompanying illustrative site plan in Appendix 2.

Compatibility with neighbouring, established uses

4.12 Mixed-use residential, office and appropriate forms of retail and commercial development on the site would be fully compatible with adjacent residential uses. Any need to retain health-related uses may also be appropriate in a future redevelopment. The scope for retail and employment uses is discussed below.

Potential Retail Uses

4.13 The emerging Local Development Plan will be required to review the existing planning framework provided by the UDP and to make provision for the future retail needs of the City. Additional spending as a result of population growth and changes in retail trends and requirements will also need to be provided for.

4.14 The need for additional retail floorspace, including both quantitative need and qualitative need, will, therefore, be identified during the Plan period. The site is well-placed to accommodate such need in sequential terms, lying as it is in a central part of the city. It is also close to public transport routes. Existing retail and commercial uses in the form of a petrol filling station with shop and a camping supplies store lie opposite the site. Whilst a major retailing use which would compete with City Centre facilities would not be appropriate on the site, smaller scale facilities, possibly in the form of a small foodstore or speciality outlets, would be acceptable.

Employment

4.15 Employment uses on the site would add to the sustainability credentials of the development. Demand will continue during the LDP period for B1 office accommodation and the site is well placed to meet this, particular as there are concentrations of office related development nearby at Stow Hill, and Clytha Park Road.

4.16 The site, therefore, meets accepted site selection criteria and it is, therefore, requested that favourable regard should be given to allocating the site for a mix of uses through the Local Development Plan process.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 The St Woolos Hospital site is being promoted at the current time in order to allow for a redevelopment opportunity which will emerge later in the Local Development Plan Period, in conjunction with proposals which will enable the implementation of a number of projects designed to improve the provision of healthcare throughout the Gwent area.

5.2 Although it is acknowledged that the site will remain in use for hospital and health uses for the foreseeable future until alternative modern purpose built replacement facilities are constructed, this submission is made to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to the site’s potential in the emerging Local Development Plan.

5.3 A sympathetically-designed, scheme would be appropriate at such a location on a site in one of the older, established parts of Newport. The setting of the adjacent Stow Park Circle Conservation Area and nearby Conservation Areas at Stow Hill and Belle Vue Park will need to be respected.

5.4 Section 4 described the extent to which the proposal accords with the relevant planning policies and in doing it is possible to conclude that the site represents an opportunity to provide a mixed form of development at a central location close to Newport City Centre.

5.5 In the light of all the aforementioned circumstances, it is considered that the proposed mixed use development at this location would be in accordance with national advice and guidance and also accords with accepted site selection criteria.

5.6 Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that in assessing Candidate Site Submissions in the emerging Newport Local Development Plan, the site in question is identified as a mixed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential with some Community uses on St Woolos Hospital site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

use land allocation for residential, employment, retail and other appropriate forms of uses.

Asbri Planning Ltd
October 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>Map Included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site proposal for Residential use of Alway Clinic site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site: 84/ Alway Clinic New Site |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: Overall Council Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>As a small site within the urban area, redevelopment would be considered against the policies of the plan, and no specific allocation is proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question: 2.1 | Site Name |
| Representation Text: | Alway Clinic |

| Question: 2.2 | Location |
| Representation Text: | Henry Wood Walk, Alway, Newport |

| Question: 2.3 | Grid Reference |
| Representation Text: | ST 342 878 |
| Council Response: | 334305 187848 |

| Question: 2.4 | Site Area |
| Representation Text: | 0.1 hectares |
| Council Response: | 0.13ha. |

| Question: 2.5 | Brief Description |
| Representation Text: | Single storey, rectangular shaped building and grassed area. |

| Question: 2.6 | Current Use |

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C4</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site proposal for Residential use of Alway Clinic site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

- **Representations Text:** Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

- **Representations Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- **Representations Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representations Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representations Text:** The site is part of the urban fabric of the area and is bounded by existing residential uses.
- **Council Response:** Countryside Comments: No strategic landscape issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

- **Representations Text:** Yes. Hedgerow enclosing site but forming boundary to residential properties.
- **Council Response:** Perimeter hedges and a few trees. TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

- **Representations Text:** Boundary vegetation retained where possible...

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

- **Representations Text:** As above

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

- **Representations Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

- **Representations Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site proposal for Residential use of Alway Clinic site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.3** Contaminated Land Risk?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.4** Flood Risk?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?
Representation Text: Yes.
Council Response: pedestrian access only vehicle access (possible) from Henry Wood walk subject to owners consent third party.

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?
Representation Text: Pedestrian links to Aberthaw Road.
Council Response: The proposed development falls within the Alway Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 7.76Ha. The size of the site would mean an off-site contribution to upgrade local play provision would be requested.
### Summary
Candidate Site proposal for Residential use of Alway Clinic site.

#### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** Bus routes already accessible at short distance from site.

#### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
- **Representation Text:** Bus services along Aberthaw Road.
- **Council Response:** 30 metres to Aberthaw Road. 185 metres east bound. 175 metres west bound.

#### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
- **Representation Text:** Hourly
- **Council Response:** 30 min frequency.

#### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Representation Text:** Newport Station – 2.5 kilometres
- **Council Response:** Newport station.

#### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** Alway local shopping centre – 500 metres.
- **Council Response:** Always district centre 400 metres

#### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** Urban location close to school, shops, community facilities.

#### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** Proximity to facilities/job opportunities – cycle way along A48, Ringland Road.
- **Council Response:** on site provision

#### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 4.9 Open Space?
- **Representation Text:** Large open space area to south of Aberthaw Road.

#### Question: 5.1 Schools?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Alway primary school (100m to west).
### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:** Funding opportunities elsewhere for improved healthcare provision.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:** Services already serving existing development.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:**

**Sewerage**

We do not envisage a problem accommodating the flows generated by the development within this area. However, we reserve our comment subject to submission of further details as to the intended site use.

**Water supply**

We do not envisage any problem in providing a domestic supply to this development. We reserve comment subject to the provision of further details as to the proposed site use.

**Sewage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

**Nash Waste Water Treatment Works**

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of...
Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?</td>
<td>Representation Text: Development of site would not set precedent for reasons above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?</td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.2 Site Owner?</td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. 4-6 years when other facilities upgraded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Promotional Submission Statement has been prepared on behalf of Gwent NHS Healthcare Trust and Welsh Health Estates who wish to promote the submission site as a candidate site for consideration through the current exercise where representations are being invited. The site consists of a single storey clinic building, and a lawned area bounded by residential properties.

1.2 The site is currently identified as being within the Urban Area boundary of Newport and is bounded by existing residential development. It, therefore, presents an opportunity to accommodate a sympathetic form of development which would be compatible with the surrounding area and which would complement regeneration initiatives in Alway.

1.3 This submission, therefore, in promoting the site for residential development will provide a description of the site at Section 2, review the planning policies relevant to the site at Section 3, provides an appraisal of the development at Section 4 and draws together the key points and conclusions at Section 5.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The submission site is located approximately 2 kilometres to the east of Newport City Centre in the Alway district. Aberthaw Road, which links the A48 Ringland Way, with the B4237, lies to the south of the site. Henry Wood Walk to the north provides vehicular access via a residential area. Alway local shopping centre lies some 500 metres to the east, whilst Alway Primary School lies 100 metres to the west.

2.2 The irregular shaped site is 0.1 hectares in area. It is accessed Henry Wood Walk to the north where on-street parking for the clinic is provided in a cul-de-sac. Pedestrian access is also provided via a gap between residential properties along Aberthaw Road.

2.3 The single storey, rectangular shaped clinic building is some 175 square metres in area and lies in the south-western portion of the site. The site is bounded on three sides by existing residential development. To the north and east of the building are grassed areas within a hedgerow which forms the site boundary.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

3.1 The policy basis for this submission derives from the content and scope of national planning guidance. It is submitted that the proposed residential development would be in accordance with national advice and guidance.

3.2 National Planning Guidance
Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) is the principal document, which sets out the land use policy context of the Welsh Assembly Government, for the consideration and evaluation of all types of development.

3.3 Planning Policy Wales confirms at Paragraph 4.1.1 that the planning system:

"...is intended to help protect the amenity and environment of towns, cities and the countryside in the public interest while promoting high quality, sustainable development."

3.4 This advisory document confirms that a primary principle or basic premise of the planning system is that it:

"...must provide for an adequate and continuous supply of land, available and suitable for development to meet society’s needs. It must do this in a way that is consistent with overall sustainability principles and objectives..." (Para 1.2.2)

3.5 Planning Policy Wales promotes the notion of sustainable development as being central to all planning decisions in Wales. It defines sustainable development as:

"...development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." (Para. 2.1.1)

3.6 Paragraph 2.1 reiterates the duty placed on the Assembly, under Section 121 of the Government of Wales Act 1998, to promote sustainable development in the exercise of its functions. The Welsh Assembly Government is promoting sustainable development planning by placing sustainability at the heart of its decision-making process, through its strategic policies, including Planning Policy Wales (March 2002).

3.7 The document outlines a number of relevant sustainable development principles, chief amongst which is the promotion of resource efficient settlement patterns and minimising land-take. There is also recognition that the location of development should aim to reduce demand for travel, especially journeys by private car.

3.8 Similarly, in terms of providing a framework for the provision of housing, one of the key policy objectives of Planning Policy Wales is to:

"Ensure that all local communities - both urban and rural - have sufficient good quality housing for their needs..." (Para. 2.3.2)

3.9 Section 2.5 provides guidance for local authorities in achieving a sustainable settlement strategy in locating new development. It states that in their land allocation policies, local planning authorities should:

• Promote sustainable patterns of development
• Maintain and improve the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town, district, local and village centres
• Foster development approaches that recognise the mutual dependence between town and country, thus improving linkages between urban areas and their rural surroundings.

3.10 Planning Policy Wales advises, in terms of the location of development in Paragraph 2.5.3, that:

"Local planning authorities should assess the extent to which community settlement strategies and new development are consistent with minimising the need to travel and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car. A broad balance between housing and employment opportunities should be promoted to minimise the need for long distance commuting. Local authorities should adopt policies to locate major generators of travel demand such as housing, employment, retailing, leisure and recreation, and community facilities, including libraries, schools and hospitals within existing urban areas or in other locations which are, or can be, well served by public transport, or can be reached by walking or cycling."

3.11 Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006 : Housing replaces Chapter 9 of PPW and provides the framework for national housing planning policy. Paragraph 9.1.1 states that the Assembly Government will seek to provide:

"homes that are in good condition, in safe neighbourhoods and sustainable communities; and greater choice for people over the type of housing and the location they live in."

3.12 and to ensure that:

• Previously developed land is used in preference to greenfield sites;
• New housing or residential environments are well designed, environmentally sound and make a significant contribution to promoting community regeneration and improving quality of life; and that
• The overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of social and market housing that retains and, where practical, enhances important landscape and wildlife features in the development."
3.13 Paragraph 9.2.8 states that:

“In identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, local planning authorities should follow a search sequence, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good public transport links.”

3.14 The MIPPS in paragraph 9.2.9 goes on to state that local planning authorities should consider the following criteria in deciding which sites to allocate for housing in their development plans:

- The availability of previously developed sites and empty or under-used buildings and their suitability for housing use;
- The location and accessibility of potential development sites to jobs, shops and services to modes other than the car, and the potential for improving such sustainability;
- The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure, including public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals) to absorb further development and the cost of adding further infrastructure;
- The ability to build sustainable communities to support new physical and social infrastructure, including consideration of the effect on the Welsh Language and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities;
- Physical and environmental constraint on development of land, including for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk, taking into account that such risk may increase as a result of climate change, and the location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes; and
- Compatibility with neighbouring established land uses which might be adversely affected by encroaching residential development.

3.15 The emerging Local Development Plan will be required to review the existing planning framework provided by the UDP and to make provision for future housing needs.

3.16 The following section will seek to establish that national planning guidance is supportive of residential development taking place on the submission site, given its positive sustainable development characteristics. In these circumstances, therefore, it is submitted that these aspects should be taken into account when assessing the allocation of the site for residential purposes through the LDP site selection process.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The new Newport Local Development Plan (LDP) is required to place an emphasis on sustainable development, transparency in the site selection process and a robust evidence base. Newport’s current Unitary Development Plan period ends in 2011 when the new LDP period commences. In terms of housing land supply much reliance will continue to be placed on land to the east of the city, associated with the former Corus steelworks together with proposed greenfield releases around the village of Llanwern, ie the Eastern Expansion Area. Much of this land is dependant on major road linkages and there remains uncertainty over the timing of development.

4.2 Newport has been successful in recent years in securing development on sites along the River Usk, Old Town Dock, Mon Bank Sidings and other sustainable locations where existing and proposed forms of development are contributing positively to enhancing the image of the new City. Selective releases will be required, however, in order to maximise housing land opportunities. These will need to include relatively small sites where high density forms of development can be accommodated which reflect the existing settlement pattern of the area and where development can be accommodated which would not represent a major intrusion into the surrounding countryside.

4.3 As part of this other submission representations are being made on behalf of the Trust and Welsh Health Estates on the LDP Strategic Options (also subject to consultation) which favour the above approach.

4.4 This Section will consider the site in the context of established site selection criteria as identified in the national planning guidance described in the previous Section.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
by: Representation No
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C4</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site proposal for Residential use of Alway Clinic site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The ability to build communities;
- Physical and environmental constraints;
- Compatibility with neighbouring land uses.

### Availability of Previously Developed Sites
4.6 The site is previously developed land and is surrounded by existing residential development. It would, therefore, 'score' highly in the search sequence referred to in paragraph 9.2.8 of Planning Policy Wales, as a settlement extension.

### Accessibility
4.7 The site has sustainable credentials in that it is situated in reasonably close proximity to Alway District Centre, which has a range of services and retail outlets.

4.9 Bus services also pass close to the site along Aberthaw Road. These include Service 6A, Newport to Always (Newport Transport) which operates on an hourly frequency Monday to Saturday.

### Capacity of Infrastructure
4.10 It is not anticipated that infrastructure provision presents a major obstacle to development.

### Ability to Build Communities
4.11 It is not anticipated that the development would have a negative impact on the community, including the Welsh Language.

### Physical and Environmental Constraints
4.12 There are no major constraints to development subject to an appropriate form of access being achieved.

### Compatibility with neighbouring, established uses
4.13 Residential development on the site would be fully compatible with adjacent residential uses. A high density scheme which either provides flat accommodation or which reflects the existing pattern of development would be appropriate on the site. It would meet accepted site selection criteria as highlighted above. It is, therefore, requested that favourable regard should be given to allocating the site for residential uses through the Local Development Plan process.

### CONCLUSIONS
5.0 This Promotional Submission Statement has been prepared on behalf of Gwent Healthcare NHS Trust and Welsh Health Estates. The site consists of enclosed grassland which accommodates a single storey clinic building,

5.1 A sympathetically-designed scheme would consolidate the existing settlement pattern on a site which has sustainability credentials in that it lies close to education and leisure facilities, public transport routes, and within a reasonable walking distance of Alway Local Shopping Centre and cycling distance of Newport City Centre.

5.3 Section 4 described the extent to which the proposal accords with the relevant planning policies and in doing it is possible to conclude that the site represents an opportunity to provide housing at a location where a sympathetic form of development could be achieved either in the form of flats, or houses which reflect the adjoining pattern of development.

5.4 In the light of all the aforementioned circumstances, it is considered that the proposed residential development at this location would be in accordance with national advice and guidance and also accords with accepted site selection criteria.

5.5 Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that in assessing Candidate Site Submissions in the emerging Newport Local Development Plan, the site in question is identified as a housing land allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site proposal for Residential use of Alway Clinic site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbri Planning Ltd</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 9**  
**Map Included?**

**Representation Text:**  
Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for appropriate reuse of Mendalgief Road Car Park site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site: 85/ Mendalgief Road Car Park**

**Question: Overall Council Response**

**Council Response:**  
The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Pillgwenlly. The site is not recommended for inclusion with the Local Development Plan given the uncertainty over the timing of the release of the land and deliverability within the plan period.

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

**Representation Text:**  
Mendalgief Road Car Park

**Question: 2.2 Location**

**Representation Text:**  
South of Capel Crescent, Newport

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

**Representation Text:**  
ST 310 869

**Council Response:**  
331089 186969

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

**Representation Text:**  
0.39 hectares

**Council Response:**  
0.47ha.

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

**Representation Text:**  
Linear tarmac – surfaced area in inner-city location.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

**Representation Text:**  
Hospital car parking area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>. Appropriate development to complement adjacent uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>. The site is part of the urban fabric of the area and is bounded by existing residential, commercial and surgery uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Countryside Comments: SPG/masterplans will require landscape &amp; countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>. Additional open space could be created as a result of a residential scheme as it is recognised that the linear form of the site will result in parts remaining free of development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>. As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.7 SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**
  - Listed building n/a
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park n/a
  - conservation area n/a
  - Within Newport boundary

## Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** Yes. Currently car park. Considerable traffic generator.

## Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

- **Representation Text:** Links via footways and road crossings already in place.
- **Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Pillgwenlly Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.19Ha. The size of the site would mean an off-site contribution to upgrade local play provision would be requested.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for appropriate reuse of Mendalgief Road Car Park site.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

- **Representation Text:** Bus routes already accessible at short distance from site.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

- **Representation Text:** Numerous bus services along Cardiff Road.

- **Council Response:**
  - Cardiff rd - 0-10 mins -60-100m from site boundary.
  - Mendalgief Rd. 10-20
  - Adjacent to site.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

- **Representation Text:** Half hourly

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

- **Representation Text:** Newport Station – 1.5 kilometres

- **Council Response:**
  - Newport 1.6km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

- **Representation Text:** Junction of Cardiff Road and Mendalgeif Road – 100 metres.

- **Council Response:**
  - City centre 600m
  - Cardiff Rd shops
  - Commercial rd 600m

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- **Representation Text:** Central city location

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

- **Representation Text:** Proximity to facilities/job opportunities.

- **Council Response:** Good links to existing infrastructure.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- **Representation Text:** Belle Vue Park to north west, open space to south-east.
### Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Pillgwenlly primary school (200m to east).

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:**
Opportunities for some development and community use of site.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:**
Services already serving existing development.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Council Response:**
Welsh Water Comments

Can confirm that from a water supply, sewerage and sewage treatment perspective we would be able to accommodate the proposed candidate sites based on their current density.

### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representation Text:**
Central area location.

### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

**Representation Text:**
Development of site would not set precedent for reasons above.

### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155.C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for appropriate reuse of Mendalgief Road Car Park site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
Representation Text: Yes. Latter part of plan period when facility no longer required as the Royal Gwent will be replaced by a new hospital.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
Representation Text: See attached submission document:

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Promotional Submission Statement has been prepared on behalf of Gwent NHS Healthcare Trust and Welsh Health Estates who wish to promote the submission site as a candidate site for consideration through the current exercise where representations are being invited. The site consists of a car park which serves the nearby Royal Gwent Hospital.

1.2 The site is currently identified as being within the Urban Area boundary of Newport and is bounded by existing residential development. It therefore presents an opportunity to accommodate a sympathetic form of development, if combined with adjacent land, which would be compatible with the surrounding area.

1.3 The site is scheduled to become surplus to requirements during the plan Period when the hospital facility is scheduled to be replaced. Separate Candidate Site representations have been submitted on the Royal Gwent site as part of the exercise which invited ‘strategic’ candidate sites in October 2008. An appropriate form of redevelopment, which will contribute to the provision of receipts for improved healthcare facilities elsewhere in the city will therefore be sought.
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The submission site is elongated in shape having previously formed part of an old railway corridor. It is located immediately adjacent to terraced properties along the south of Capel Crescent where a back lane provides rear access to the properties. To the south the site adjoins Belle Vue Surgery, with a pharmacy building to the west, and a social club to the south-east, with associated areas of car parking. It is currently accessed directly off Mendalgief Road at its western end.

2.2 The irregular shaped site is 0.39 hectares in area.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

3.1 The policy basis for this submission derives from the content and scope of national planning guidance. It is submitted that the proposed residential development would be in accordance with national advice and guidance.

3.2 National Planning Guidance

Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) is the principal document, which sets out the land use policy context of the Welsh Assembly Government, for the consideration and evaluation of all types of development.

3.3 Planning Policy Wales confirms at Paragraph 4.1.1 that the planning system:

"I}|ps}sis intended to help protect the amenity and environment of towns, cities and the countryside in the public interest while promoting high quality, sustainable development."

3.4 This advisory document confirms that a primary principle or basic premise of the planning system is that it:

"I}|ps}s must provide for an adequate and continuous supply of land, available and suitable for development to meet society’s needs. It must do this in a way that is consistent with overall sustainability principles and objectives." (Para 1.2.2)

3.5 Planning Policy Wales promotes the notion of sustainable development as being central to all planning decisions in Wales. It defines sustainable development as:

"I}|ps}sdevelopment that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." (Para. 2.1.1)

3.6 Paragraph 2.1 reiterates the duty placed on the Assembly, under Section 121 of the Government of Wales Act 1998, to promote sustainable development in the exercise of its functions. The Welsh Assembly Government is promoting sustainable development planning by placing sustainability at the heart of its decision-making process, through its strategic policies, including Planning Policy Wales (March 2002).

3.7 The document outlines a number of relevant sustainable development principles, chief amongst which is the promotion of resource efficient settlement patterns and minimising land take. There is also recognition that the location of development should aim to reduce demand for travel, especially journeys by private car.

3.8 Similarly, in terms of providing a framework for the provision of housing, one of the key policy objectives of Planning Policy Wales is to:

"I}|ps}Ensure that all local communities - both urban and rural - have sufficient good quality housing for their needs..." (Para. 2.3.2)

3.9 Section 2.5 provides guidance for local authorities in achieving a sustainable settlement strategy in locating new development. It states that in their land allocation policies, local planning authorities should:

* Promote sustainable patterns of development
* Maintain and improve the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town, district, local and village centres
3.10 Planning Policy Wales advises, in terms of the location of development in Paragraph 2.5.3, that:-

"Local planning authorities should assess the extent to which community settlement strategies and new development are consistent with minimising the need to travel and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car. A broad balance between housing and employment opportunities should be promoted to minimise the need for long distance commuting. Local authorities should adopt policies to locate major generators of travel demand such as housing, employment, retailing, leisure and recreation, and community facilities, including libraries, schools and hospitals within existing urban areas or in other locations which are, or can be, well served by public transport, or can be reached by walking or cycling."

3.11 Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006: Housing replaces Chapter 9 of PPW and provides the framework for national housing planning policy. Paragraph 9.1.1 states that the Assembly Government will seek to provide:-

"homes that are in good condition, in safe neighbourhoods and sustainable communities; and greater choice for people over the type of housing and the location they live in."

3.12 and to ensure that:-

• Previously developed land is used in preference to greenfield sites;
• New housing or residential environments are well designed, environmentally sound and make a significant contribution to promoting community regeneration and improving quality of life; and that
• The overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of social and market housing that retains and, where practical, enhances important landscape and wildlife features in the development."

3.13 Paragraph 9.2.8 states that:-

"In identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, local planning authorities should follow a search sequence, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good public transport links."

3.14 The MIPPS in paragraph 9.2.9 goes on to state that local planning authorities should consider the following criteria in deciding which sites to allocate for housing in their development plans:-

• The availability of previously developed sites and empty or under-used buildings and their suitability for housing use;
• The location and accessibility of potential development sites to jobs, shops and services to modes other than the car, and the potential for improving such sustainability;
• The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure, including public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals) to absorb further development and the cost of adding further infrastructure;
• The ability to build sustainable communities to support new physical and social infrastructure, including consideration of the effect on the Welsh Language and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities;
• Physical and environmental constraint on development of land, including for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk, taking into account that such risk may increase as a result of climate change, and the location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes; and
• Compatibility with neighbouring established land uses which might be adversely affected by encroaching residential development.

3.15 The emerging Local Development Plan will be required to review the existing planning framework provided by the UDP and to make provision for future housing needs.

3.16 The following section will seek to establish that national planning guidance is supportive of residential development, or other appropriate forms of development taking place on the submission site, given its positive sustainable development characteristics. In these circumstances, therefore, it is submitted that these aspects should be taken into account when assessing the allocation of the site for residential purposes through the LDP site selection process.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The new Newport Local Development Plan (LDP) is required to place an emphasis on sustainable development, transparency in the site selection process and a robust evidence...
4.2 Newport, has been successful in recent years in securing development on sites along the River Usk, Old Town Dock, Mon Bank Sidings and other sustainable locations where existing and proposed forms of development are contributing positively to enhancing the image of the new City. Selective releases will be required, however, in order to maximise housing land opportunities. These will need to include relatively small sites where high density forms of development can be accommodated which reflect the existing settlement pattern of the area.

4.3 As part of the submissions made on behalf of Gwent Healthcare Trust and Welsh Health Estates representations are also being submitted on the LDP Strategic Options (also subject to consultation) which favour the above approach.

4.4 This Section will consider the site in the context of established site selection criteria as identified in the national planning guidance described in the previous Section.

Consideration of the Site Against Established Site Selection Criteria

4.5 Planning Policy Wales and the Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/06 provide criteria for the identification of housing allocation sites as follows:

- The availability of previously developed sites and buildings;
- Accessibility to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car;
- The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure;
- The ability to build communities;
- Physical and environmental constraints;
- Compatibility with neighbouring land uses.

Availability of Previously Developed Sites

4.6 The site is previously developed land, having previously accommodated a railway line, and subsequently in use as a car park. It would therefore ‘score’ highly in the search sequence referred to in paragraph 9.2.8 of Planning Policy Wales, as a site within a central urban location.

Accessibility

4.7 The site has sustainable credentials in that it is situated in reasonably close proximity to Commercial Road District Centre (approximately 500 metres), which has a range of services and retail outlets, and some 700 metres from Newport City Centre which is a sub-regional centre with a wide range of facilities. Pillgwenlly Primary School lies 200 metres from the site along Capel Crescent and Pillgwenlly Leisure Centre a short distance further to the south. Belle Vue Surgery lies directly to the south of the site.

4.8 Bus services also pass close to the site along Cardiff Road where there is an bus stops within a short walk of the site boundary. The services include:

- Service (Operator) Route Frequency (Mon to Sat)
  - 34/35 (Newport Transport) Newport - Duffryn Half Hourly
  - 36 (Newport Transport) Newport – Celtic Springs Half Hourly
  - 32/33 (Newport Transport) Newport – Rhwaderin Half Hourly
  - 31 (Newport Transport) Newport – Marshfield Half Hourly
  - 30 (Newport/Cardiff Transport) Newport - Cardiff15 minutes
  - X15 (Stagecoach) Newport – Brynmawr-Abertillery Half hourly
  - X18 Newport - Ebbw Vale-Newbridge Hourly

Capacity of Infrastructure

4.9 It is not anticipated that infrastructure provision presents a major obstacle to development.

Ability to Build Communities
4.10 It is not anticipated that the development would have a negative impact on the community, including the Welsh Language.

Physical and Environmental Constraints
4.11 There are no major constraints to development although it is acknowledged that the site would be difficult to develop in its own right and adjacent land, occupied by surgery and social club car parking, as well as residual open areas, will need to be incorporated in order to achieve development on the whole of the site. In order to facilitate an acceptable layout, there are opportunities to rationalise the car parking needs of the area by utilising parts of the submission site.

Compatibility with neighbouring, established uses
4.13 A scheme which reflects the existing pattern of development would be most appropriate on the site. It would also meet accepted site selection criteria. It is, therefore, requested that favourable regard should be given to allocating the site for residential uses through the Local Development Plan process.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 This Promotional Submission Statement has been prepared on behalf of Gwent Healthcare NHS Trust and Welsh Health Estates. The site consists of a car park area used as ‘overspill’ hospital parking for the Royal Gwent and St Woolos Hospital sites.

5.2 Although the site is elongated and narrow, a sympathetically-designed scheme, incorporating adjacent areas of land would consolidate the existing settlement pattern on a site which has sustainability credentials in that it lies close to education and leisure facilities, public transport routes, and within a reasonable walking distance of Commercial Road District Centre and Newport City Centre. It is suggested that the car parking needs of the adjacent uses could be examined as a whole in order to establish a developable site area.

5.3 Section 4 described the extent to which the proposal accords with the relevant planning policies and in doing it is possible to conclude that the site represents an opportunity to provide housing or other uses at a sustainable location.

5.4 In the light of all the aforementioned circumstances, it is considered that development at this location would be in accordance with national advice and guidance and also accords with accepted site selection criteria.

5.5 Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that in assessing Candidate Site Submissions in the emerging Newport Local Development Plan, the site in question is identified as a development land allocation.

Asbri Planning Ltd
May 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
<td><strong>SA Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>It is recommended that this site is not carried forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Site contains a part of the SSSI, SINC; is close to a SAC and SPA;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ No designated open space for recreation- likely to lead to negative effects, from use of countryside areas for recreation, on designated sites for nature conservation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Site contains a listed building: It is recommended that the setting and value of the listed building are enhanced through the development of the site loss of 141ha green space including some valuable agricultural land;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Increased potential for pollution to land, air, water and noise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Flood risk area (C1); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Directly adjacent to the Nash/Goldcliff coastal zone historic landscape character area of the Gwent Levels- likely to have a negative effect on the landscape character- site is characterised including abundant archaeological remains, which may be affected negatively by development adjacent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question: | **Overall Council Response** |
| Council Response: | Located between existing industrial areas, the site provides opportunities for further provision of employment. The northern part of the site adjoins newport International Sports Village and provides opportunities for leisure use. |

| Question: | **2.1 Site Name** |
| Representation Text: | Solutia Fields, Nash Road |

| Question: | **2.2 Location** |
| Representation Text: | West of Nash Road |

| Question: | **2.3 Grid Reference** |
| Representation Text: | ST 338 858 |
| Council Response: | 334053 185609 |

| Question: | **2.4 Site Area** |
| Representation Text: | 30 hectares approx |
| Council Response: | 46.68ha. |

| Question: | **2.5 Brief Description** |
| Representation Text: | Fallow fields |
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted late

Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
169.C1 27/04/2009 P W ME
Summary: Candidate Site for Industrial or Commercial use of Solutia Fields, Nash Road.

Question: 2.6 Current Use
Representation Text: None

Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
Representation Text: Industrial or Commercial

Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
Representation Text: Adjacent to operating chemical works.

Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
Representation Text: Yes. TPO 6/2006 protects some along northern and north-eastern edge.
Council Response: TPOs protect two areas of Mixed Deciduous Woodland. TPO 6/2006 and additional TPO potential

Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
Representation Text:

Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: On Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169.C1</td>
<td>27/04/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late?</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Industrial or Commercial use of Solutia Fields, Nash Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.2** Greenfield?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3** Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** No. Not contaminated as defined in the Contaminated Land (Wales) Regulations 2001.

**Question: 3.4** Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** Risk 1:200 or less according to Environment Agency Wales (22/9/08) for the Chemical Works. These fields are further away from tidal inundation and so the risk is lower. In 2007 no objection was raised by the Environment Agency Wales regarding flooding of a proposed development (Falcon Steel 07/45) to the immediate North West. It therefore appears that development cannot be resisted on the grounds that it does not satisfy the aims and objectives of TAN 15.

**Council Response:** Zone C1.

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** No. Only reens

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** This is a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation. There is a species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Adjacent to Nash Road so access can be created easily. Field gates at present. MDW haulage access Nash Road directly at present.

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169.C1</td>
<td>27/04/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Industrial or Commercial use of Solutia Fields, Nash Road.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
Newport has a shortfall in play space of 10.46Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Council Response:**
yes
full transport assessment required. Access to bothcporation road and meadow road preferred.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**

200 metres from edge of site

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**

2 hour service

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**

newport station

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
nash road shop 100m to nearest part of site.
Newport retail park 3.4km

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**
Solutia has supported construction of Cycleroute 4 on it's land to the south.

**Council Response:**
on site provision and infrastructure linking onto Nash rd cycle route.
Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Footpath crosses northern part of site. 395/15

Question: 4.9 Open Space?
Representation Text: .
Council Response: Spytty Park to north.

Question: 5.1 Schools?
Representation Text: Yes.   Lliswerry High School to the north.
Council Response: Also Coleg Gwent.

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
Representation Text: .

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
Representation Text: .

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
Representation Text: No.   We intend to retain most of the North-Eastern field as a buffer between the residents of Traston Road and the proposed site for development.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
Representation Text: .
Council Response: Welsh Water Comments
Sewerage
From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be
considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the

devolution it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling

assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we

may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an

adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. Any upgrade of this asset will likely be

considerably expensive. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site

usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Logical Extension?</td>
<td>Site is within urban boundary in the UDP, allocated for employment purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Precedent Setting?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Site Owner?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?</td>
<td>Yes. We own fields to the south, leased to Gwent Wildlife Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16/02/2012
### Question: 7.6  Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

### Question: 7.7  Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169.C1</td>
<td>27/04/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Industrial or Commercial use of Solutia Fields, Nash Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Landfill Operation (Phase 3)**
95/0241 05/05/1995 Granted with Conditions

**Development of land for B1 (business) use**
90/0225 08/06/1990 Refused (Appeal dismissed 18/02/1991)

**Increase in the depth of Landfill**
96/0368 14/06/1996 Granted with Conditions

**No objections**

**Development of land for B1 (business) use**
90/0225 08/06/1990 Refused (Appeal dismissed 18/02/1991)

**Head of Public Protection and Environmental Services:** Advise that conditions be attached regarding the possible contamination of the land. No objection regarding the noise report submitted.

**Countryside Council for Wales:** No objection providing that the development is carried out with compliance of a ‘Great Crested Newt Mitigation Strategy’ by Hyder Consulting dated 1 May 2007.

**Environment Agency:** No objection to the proposal but concerns over possible contamination of the watercourse and suggest conditions.

**National Assembly for Wales (Transport Wales):** 130M hazard zone around the turbines and from the edge of the proposed M4 relief road is acceptable.

**Civil Aviation Authority:** Advised to contact Bristol International Airport and Bristol Filton Airports. Aviation obstruction lighting may be required. All structures over a height of 300
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>27/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Industrial or Commercial use of Solutia Fields, Nash Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR LIGHT INDUSTRY AND WAREHOUSING**

89/0556 06/10/1989 Granted with conditions

Enforcement Action


95/0240 - Proposed Landfill (phase 2). Decision: Granted with conditions. 05/05/1995.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

Representation Text: .

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

### Question: Salisbury Area Recommendation

**Council Response:**
Mix of uses unknown- should be employment led to balance with the provision of housing on 198.C1; potential effects such as increased traffic levels and noise pollution should be mitigated through the design process. SINC adjacent; close to SAC (river): It is recommended that the potential negative effects on biodiversity are investigated and mitigated prior to the commencement of development as part of a wider scheme to mitigate the potential of the development of the LDP on sites designated for nature conservation interests.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
Outline planning permission was granted on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate for residential development and associated works during 2011 (Ref 07/0540). The permission was subject to a Section 106 agreement (which has been signed) for a number of contributions including, highways, education, affordable housing, leisure and monitoring fee.

It is recommended that the site is allocated as a housing commitment in the Local Development Plan.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:**
Monmouthshire Bank Sidings

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:**
Monmouthshire Bank Sidings, Maesglas, Newport

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**
305 866

**Council Response:**
330994 186576

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:**
20.63 hectares

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:**
The majority of the site is now vacant although 6 hectares of land on the southern portion of the site is operational land for the recycling of railway ballast. Overall the site is generally flat but the levels have been increased over the years by the workings associated with its historical use and there is now a 3-6 metre difference in height between the site and the adjoining Whitehead Works. Vehicular access to the site is currently taken from the south eastern boundary via a roundabout on Usk Way.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use
Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>198.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
<td>Late?</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site Proposal for up to 850 residential units at Monbank Sidings

Majority of the site is vacant, although land on the southern portion of the site is operational land for the recycling of railway ballast. A planning permission for a replacement facility off-site has been achieved.

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- Development of up to 850 residential units.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- Yes. Previously used as railway sidings. The site is now open waste ground, except for areas to the south of the site which are used to recover aggregate from used railway ballast.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- The local landscape is urban in character, with a variety of land uses surrounding the site. The proposed residential use would therefore be particularly suitable in this location, and would not be considered to be intrusive. The proposed development would have a positive impact on the local landscape, because the site is currently mainly disused and does not make a positive impact on the landscape.

**Council Response:**
- Countryside Comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- No. There are a number of mature trees on the site, along the boundary with the adjoining Whiteheads Works site. These trees are not protected.

**Council Response:**
- TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- The site currently has little in the way of landscape or biodiversity features.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- No. The site will provide for a number of green spaces within the scheme and as such, the amount of accessible green spaces within the local area will increase.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- No.

**Council Response:**
- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Former railway sidings, now removed. No other archaeological features known. No reason for not allocating in LDP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Greenfield?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Ground contamination has been recorded across the site area and, in particular is associated with arsenic and cyanide. A limited number of 'hot spots' of organic TPH contamination have been identified, which are considered to require or may require off-site removal to a licensed landfill, which will be determined via further testing. To mitigate risk to human health it is also advised that imported clean cover is emplaced across all garden areas and across all areas of open space, landscaped and play areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Flood Risk?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Majority of the site located within Flood Zone B. As such, a detailed FCA has been produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 SSSI?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Protected Species?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>The Environmental Dimension Partnership (EDP) has produced an 'Ecological Appraisal' for the site and also undertaken a Phase II Survey Report for the site, in support of the planning application for the site (reference no. 07/0540). The Phase II Survey Report sets out the results of further survey work on the presence of reptiles, breeding birds, flora and invertebrates. In relation to reptiles, it is recommended, given the species evident on site, that a mitigation strategy be undertaken involving the capture/translocation of individual to an on or off site habitat. Detailed survey work in relation the other species has confirmed that the other species will not constrain development provided works are undertaken to existing habitats and the species located within are effectively managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Response:</th>
<th>Listed building n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historic park n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conservation area n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Newport boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?

*Representations Text:* yes this site is the subsent of an outline planning application. Capacity is acceptable secondary access onto Docks way required to be considered with adjacent whiteheads site.

*Council Response:* Yes. The TA submitted in support of the application, produced by Mouchel, has found that the proposed access on Cardiff Road is capable of supporting the level of traffic likely to be generated by the development of up to 850 residential units.

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?

*Representations Text:* The proposed development falls within the Pillgwenlly Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.19Ha. In addition the Stow Hill Ward (where Belle Vue park is located) has a shortfall in Formal Play of 6.56Ha and Equipped Play of 0.92Ha. It is suggested that the provision of 4 LAP’s and a LEAP would provide the minimum amount of play space across the development to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development. In addition and off-site contribution would be requested to upgrade local formal play spaces.

*Council Response:* The proposed development will provide for open space, as an integral element of the scheme. As such, the development will improve the supply of open space in this area.

**Question: 4.11** Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

*Representations Text:* The site is centrally located, on a main public transport route. As such, it is expected that the proposed development will make use of these routes and support the potential development of improved transport links.

*Council Response:* A number of bus routes are available on Cardiff Road, with the closest bus stop available at Waterloo Road (travelling northeast), approximately 160 metres from the proposed access road.

**Question: 4.2** Bus Route?

*Representations Text:* Cardiff road over 400m docks way

*Council Response:* Cardiff road over 400m docks way

**Question: 4.3** Bus Frequency?

*Representations Text:* There are approximately 6 different bus routes which run along Cardiff Road. The frequency of these bus routes varies between three per hour, to one every other hour. During the peak periods, there are approximately 11-12 buses per hour stopping at the Waterloo Road bus stop and travelling in a north-easterly direction.

*Council Response:* good diverted service required

**Question: 4.4** Railway Station?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>198.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text**: Newport Railway Station is approximately 1.5miles from the site.

**Council Response**: Newport station 2miles

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text**: Commercial Road is located approximately 1.5km to the east of the site and Alexandra Road is also located approximately 1km to the south east of the site, both of which provide a range of convenience shopping and other facilities.

**Council Response**: A number of supermarkets are also available within the retail parks located approximately 1km to the south and to the west of the site.

**Representation Text**: 150 metres from southern site boundary to maesglas retail park liddl etc.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text**: The site is centrally located within Newport, within close proximity to the City Centre, where a wide range of jobs and community services exist. There are also a number of schools, medical facilities and areas of open space within walking distance from the site.

**Council Response**: The proposed development will facilitate and make provision for cyclists and pedestrians. The development will comprise improved cycle and pedestrian links to maximise the site’s sustainable location, close to Newport city centre.

**Representation Text**: on site infrastructure and facilities linking onto Doctis Way cycle way

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text**: The proposed development will facilitate and make provision for cyclists and pedestrians. The development will comprise improved cycle and pedestrian links to maximise the site’s sustainable location, close to Newport city centre.

**Council Response**: on site infrastructure and facilities linking onto Doctis Way cycle way

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text**: No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text**: Belle Vue Park is located approximately 200m to the north east of the proposed Cardiff Road access, which provides approximately 105,000m² of useable green space.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text**: Yes. Local schools include St Michaels Primary School, to the east of the site, Maesglas Primary School to the southwest of the site and St Woolos Primary School to the north of the site. Additionally, two secondary schools, Duffryn High School and C A Green are located in close proximity to the site, being approximately 2.5kms and 2.7kms from the site respectively.

**Council Response**: Pillgwenny Primary School is approximately 1.1km to east.
Gaer Primary School about 1.1km to north-west.
Maesglas Primary School about 1.2km to south-west.
St Woolos Primary School about 1.4km to north-east.
Duffryn Comprehensive is about 2.6km to south-west.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text**: Yes. A public consultation exercise has been undertaken through the statutory UDP process and through consultation as part of the existing planning application.
Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

Representations Text:
- The development will provide a high quality residential scheme, which is required in this central, sustainable location. As such, this scheme will meet community aspirations for housing within this area.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

Representations Text:
- No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Representations Text:
- Gas services are located in a number of locations adjacent to the site. Likewise, electricity and telecom services are located adjacent to the site. Sewage and water supplies will require upgrades and we are currently in discussions with suppliers over this.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representations Text:
- No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representations Text:
- Yes. As discussed above at 6.1, sewage and water supplies will require upgrades and we are currently in discussions with suppliers over this.

Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from...
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Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.4</th>
<th>Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.5</th>
<th>Logical Extension?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The proposed development site is located within the central urban area within Newport, surrounded by a variety of uses including residential. As previously developed land, in a central and sustainable location, the site is considered to be particularly suitable for residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.6</th>
<th>Precedent Setting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The development will provide opportunities for links to be created between the site and the adjoining Whiteheads Works site, once development proposals for the site progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.1</th>
<th>Site Owned by Proposer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.2</th>
<th>Site Owner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.3</th>
<th>Interest in Adjoining Land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.4</th>
<th>Restrictive Covenants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.5</th>
<th>Realistic Timescale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. It is expected that work would start on the site within 1 -3 years of the start of the LDP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stage=C; not submitted Late**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>198.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. The site is currently allocated for residential development through Policy H1 (44) of the UDP, which identifies the site as being capable of accommodating up to 450 units. This allocation would need to be amended to allow up to 850 residential units on the site.

*Council Response:* UDP requires a brief for a comprehensive development for residential, B1, B8 and Health Trust uses with the adjoining Whitehead Works site.

---

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Application Reference 08/0762 for the Creation of access onto Cardiff Road, including traffic signal controlled junction and replacement bridge. Permission was granted 20 November 2008.

*Council Response:* RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND ASSOCIATED WORKS (OUTLINE) Appeal for non-determination submitted

HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: No objection to access onto Cardiff Road. However whilst this access is capable of accommodating the proposed development in capacity terms, from a design and sustainability point of view a second access is also required to the south of the site to accommodate all vehicles (private and buses). The proposed development only shows provision for an emergency vehicle access although the applicant has offered to make an unfettered financial contribution towards a full secondary access should the Council wish to implement it. Notwithstanding this it is not possible to assess whether the proposed access provision would be the most rational approach in relation to the whole regeneration area in the absence of an adopted masterplan or Planning Framework Brief.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH): In terms of contamination of the site the following additional work would be required which can be secured by conditions requiring desktop study, site investigation, risk assessment, method statement and validation report:
- site investigation - further ground sampling may be required, in particular the central areas of the site, as previous sampling has been concentrated around the boundaries. Further sampling will therefore help identify contaminant hot spots for treatment/removal;
- further testing (leachate) and speciation of PAH testing hot spots;
- full Quantitative Risk Assessments and conceptual models for human health and aquatic environment;
- a full remediation strategy based on the findings of the site investigation and the results of risk assessment modelling;
- it is likely that a requirement of a minimum of 600mm of clean cover material will be needed for all garden/play areas regardless of location;
- a full validation survey will be requested following remediation works.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (BIODIVERSITY OFFICER): No objection raised and welcomes the fact that survey information on reptiles, breeding birds, and flora accompanied the application. Request that a bat survey of mature trees be undertaken should it be identified at the detailed application stage that any such trees may need to be felled. Recommend conditions, should the application be approved, requiring mitigation strategies for reptiles, breeding birds, invertebrates and the nationally scarce plant species Dittander.

HEAD OF LIFELONG LEARNING AND LEISURE: In line with the Supplementary Planning Guidance for Outdoor Play Space formal and informal play space would be required supported by an appropriate commuted sum. It should be noted that the attenuation pond of 8,350 sqm cannot be used as a contribution to play space requirements, as outlined in the NPFA guidelines. The European Safety standards – EN 1176 states that a play area should be clear and open to view and not obscured by various types of planting or development. Would advise that any planting used should be installed sympathetically and selected to be low growing, thereby ensuring that theuser groups are not put at risk by being hidden from view.

HEAD OF EDUCATION SERVICES RESOURCES AND PLANNING: In order to mitigate the impact of additional children on existing schools (Duffryn High School and Pillgwenlly Primary School) financial contributions are required the amounts dependent on the number and mix of housing or, in the case of Primary education, provision of a new school.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: No objection raised on flood risk grounds subject to a condition requiring provision of a surface water regulation system. In terms of groundwater and...
contaminated land the site is situated on a minor aquifer which potentially provides baseflow to surface water features in the area and/or a resource for supply in the area. This is therefore a potentially sensitive location with respect to the protection of controlled waters. As such conditions are recommended requiring contamination investigation and mitigation and control over infiltration of surface water into the ground. In relation to environmental management advice is provided in relation to waste material generated during construction. With respect to drainage, foul drainage via the main sewer is acceptable provided there is adequate capacity in the system. Surface water should be kept separate from foul water. Biodiversity considerations involve potential impact on the River Usk Special Area of Conservation Area (SAC) and the need for an appropriate assessment to be undertaken. The EA fully support recommendations of the submitted protected species report. The EA would encourage retention of mature trees and hedgerow for their conservation and aesthetic value and any removal should be outside of the months March to June (inclusive) in order to protect breeding birds. Mature trees should be surveyed for bats before any tree work is undertaken. Measures to prevent spread of Japanese Knotweed would be required.

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: Agree with the conclusion of the appropriate assessment with regards to the potential impacts on the River Usk Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). CCW initially commented in relation to the impact on the SAC and SSSI that the site is situated on a minor aquifer which potentially provides baseflow to surface water features in the area. The concerns (which have now been addressed in the appropriate assessment) in relation to the SAC and SSSI therefore related to possible discharge of contaminated surface and ground water to the River Usk with potential resultant impacts on fish and otter features of the SAC. In relation to proposals to discharge surface water into existing watercourses, CCW advise that appropriate measures such as interceptors are required. CCW also wish to be assured that in relation to drainage the existing sewer system has sufficient capacity to deal with foul sewage from the site.

In terms of protected species, CCW agree with the recommendations of the protected species survey undertaken namely that a further bat survey would be required should any of the mature trees along the eastern boundary of the site be affected. CCW also concur that a mitigation strategy is required in relation to reptiles present on the site detailing how they would be accommodated during and post development and welcome post development monitoring of the reptile populations.

DWR CYMRU WELSH WATER: In relation to sewerage and water supply there is currently insufficient capacity in the system. However, DCWW recommend that details of measures for providing sufficient sewerage capacity can be secured by condition on the basis that there is a solution to address DCWW requirements following completion a hydraulic modelling exercise. The preferred option identified involves a pumped solution directly to the Newport trunk sewer. However, it is stressed that this solution only relates to the development of the application site for residential use and does not take account of the comprehensive development of the whole regeneration area. As such a more comprehensive solution to drainage may be achieved if the regeneration area was considered on a comprehensive basis. DCWW maintain their objection in relation to water supply on the grounds that a modelling assessment has not been carried out in this respect.

GWENT ORNITHOLOGICAL SOCIETY: It is noted from Phase 2 Survey Report 1.3 that it was considered that a bird survey for breeding birds was necessary, because of the potentially suitable habitat for supporting notable breeding birds. The British Trust for Ornithology who organise the National Breeding Bird Survey recommend that one survey visit takes place in April to mid-May and a second from mid-May to late June. The site survey was conducted on three days at the end of August which is outside of the breeding season of most UK birds. This survey is therefore of little or no value. The fact that no Herring Gulls or Lesser Black-backed Gulls were observed when the second biggest such colony in the county is adjacent, exemplifies this point. An impact assessment on the Gull colony needs to be undertaken along with a survey of breeding birds to be undertaken at a time when birds are actually nesting.

GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: As the site has been raised with the use of ballast before the railway sidings were laid then unless this is removed, which is unlikely, it is unlikely that archaeological features would be revealed. As such GGAT raise no objection to the planning application.

HEDDLU GWENT POLICE ARCHITECTURAL LIAISON OFFICER: No objection to the land being used for residential use but raise concerns about the potential increase in dwellings together with the associated car parking facilities provided. As such the police would wish to be consulted on future detailed applications for the site in order to comment on site layout and design, security and other related crime and disorder issues. General security advice is also offered.

FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE: The developer should consider the need for the provision of adequate water supplies on the site for fire-fighting purposes and access for emergency fire-fighting appliances.

WALES AND WEST UTILITIES: Details provided of mains records and general conditions relating to protection of apparatus and prevention of disruption to gas supplies.
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**WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION:** Details of apparatus in the vicinity of the site provided. Details of safe working procedures in the vicinity of plant.

**NEWPORT CIVIC SOCIETY:** Consider the proposed density of development to be far too high and that the density proposed in planning permission No 02/0294 should be adhered to (Note: Application No 02/0294 was for an access only to serve the regeneration site and was not an application for residential development - the site area was restricted to the location of the access).

**CREATION OF ACCESS ONTO CARDIFF ROAD, INCLUDING TRAFFIC SIGNAL CONTROLLED JUNCTION AND REPLACEMENT BRIDGE**

02/0294 19/11/2002 Granted with Conditions

**NEIGHBOURS:** 70,72,74,78 - 106 (even), McDonalds, Cardiff Road; 1 - 10 Gaer Street; 2 - 18
Waterloo Road; 1 - 9,13 - 25 Aubrey Hames Close; 1 - 7 Oaks Close; 50,53 and 54 Lyndhurst Avenue;
1,2 and 4 Caer Brynton Road; Colicolour, Colomet and Profiled Cladding Systems Whitehead Estate:

8 letters of objection regarding:
- adverse impact on residential amenity.
- better access would be off Docks Way away for residential properties.
- proposed pedestrian crossing would take away privacy of residents.
- construction works would cause problems of noise, dirt and dust.
- previous developments have already affected privacy and increased traffic, and this would be made worse.
- loss of trees and demolition of important wall.
- impact on natural habitat and effect on birds.
- increased noise and disturbance from traffic, especially vehicles stopping and starting from new traffic lights.
- increased light pollution.
- Waterloo junction is far better location for new junction and wouldn’t affect residents.
- would result in three sets of traffic lights within 500 yards of each other.
- bus lane would create enough traffic problems without further traffic.
- Cardiff Road is a narrow dangerous road.
- proposal will result in more congestion and pollution caused by new lights.
- traffic headlights will shine into houses opposite new junction.

**REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE FOR B1 (BUSINESS) B2 (INDUSTRIAL) AND B8 (STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION) PURPOSES**
91/0057 11/12/1990 (received) In Abeyance

**BASEMENT**

**REALIGNMENT OF BALLAST STONE DEPOT TO FACILITATE REDEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING BALLAST TIP**
91/0158 11/03/1994 Refused (no appeal info available)

**BASEMENT**

**CREATION OF ACCESS ONTO CARDIFF ROAD, INCLUDING TRAFFIC SIGNAL CONTROLLED JUNCTION AND REPLACEMENT BRIDGE**

08/0762 20/11/2008 Granted with conditions

**NEIGHBOURS:** 4 letters received objecting on the following grounds:
- concern about additional traffic exacerbating existing heavy traffic and noise levels and that additional traffic signals and traffic will create more chaos;
- concern about additional traffic noise further added to by traffic held up at a signal controlled junction and crossing the different road surfacing associated with such a junction;
- exacerbating existing saturation of lights in the area with the addition of traffic lights would be intolerable. Alternative access points at the Tesco junction, or onto Old Maesglas Road and onto the ring road, or at the Waterloo Road junction with Cardiff Road would be better;
- property opposite the proposed junction would be directly affected due to the following: danger when exiting from driveway due to increased pedestrians crossing and cyclists and the bus lane and uncertainty about status of traffic lights; impossibility, in the absence of provision, of access to the driveway when turning from the westbound carriageway; problem with turning left into drive across bus lane with respect to traffic signal status; extra construction and operational traffic resulting in additional fumes
and noise from traffic manoeuvring at the junction; headlights shining into windows from traffic joining Cardiff Road; danger from cyclists bypassing the traffic lights added to when exiting the drive or when children playing in the drive; additional people taking their dogs to Belle Vue Park from the proposed new residential site via this access would cause loss of amenity from dogs roaming into garden; loss of value to property (note: this is not a planning consideration); - the extra traffic, noise and pollution that will result from this application.

A further letter raises the following comments: would wish to see a replacement wall to replace that proposed to be demolished along the boundary of the site ideally of the same appearance as the existing wall to maintain character of the area. Request that as many trees as possible are preserved or at the very least replaced.

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: Yes. Planning Application Reference 07/0540 for Residential Development and Associated Works – Land to Rear of White Head Works, Cardiff Road, Newport (Monmouthshire Bank Sidings Site) is subject to a current appeal against nondetermination.

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text: Please see enclosed covering letter and Candidate Site Statement for further information.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Savills have been instructed by Network Rail to promote land at Monmouthshire Bank Sidings as a Candidate Site for a residential development within the forthcoming Newport Local Development Plan (LDP).

1.2 The site is currently allocated within the UDP for housing purposes. This site remains to be suitable for such use and therefore a continued allocation for residential use is sought.

2.0 Site Description and Background

2.1 The previously developed site, which extends to approximately 20.63 hectares, is situated approximately 1.5 kilometres southwest of Newport City Centre and is bounded to the north by the A48 Cardiff road and the Cardiff-Newport railway line. To the east of the site is situated the Whitehead Steel Works, and to the west and south are further railway lines.

2.2 The site is 1 kilometre from the Commercial Road District Centre which has an extensive range of retail outlets, community and leisure facilities, as well as the main bus and railway stations serving Newport and the wider South Wales network.

2.3 The majority of the site has remained vacant for many years, although 6 hectares of land on the southern portion of the site is operational land for the recycling of railway ballast. The overall site is generally flat but the levels have been increased over the years by the workings associated with its historical use and there is now a 3-6 metre difference in height between the site and Whitehead Works.

2.4 Vehicular access to the site is currently taken from the south eastern boundary via a roundabout on Usk Way. The site is served by existing bus routes along Cardiff Road.

3.0 Suitability of the Site for Residential Development

3.1 The site is currently allocated through Policy H1 (44) of the Newport UDP for residential development. Policy H1 considers that the site is capable of accommodating 450 residential
3.2 Subsequent survey work, including a Transportation Assessment, has established that the site is potentially capable of accommodating significantly more development, up to 850 units. The increased number of units proposed would be appropriate given the accessibility of the site and accords with planning policy objectives of achieving the most efficient use of land.

3.3 The site is currently subject to an outline planning application for up to 850 units. This currently awaits determination. The application has been subject to consultation, which has not revealed any significant objections.

3.4 The site is the largest brownfield site in the urban area and as stated within the UDP:

‘In terms of sustainability the site is considered ideally located in being within 1 mile of the city centre, between two main radial roads and bus routes, and within ¼ mile of retail sites (food and non-food) at Cardiff Road and Maesglas.’ (paragraph 3.23)

3.5 The UDP Inspectors report also highlights the sites appropriateness for residential development and states that:

‘The Mon Bank/Whitehead site would, by common consent, be ideal for housing. Their allocation as housing sites would boost the proportion of brownfield residential sites in the Plan and would assist in the regeneration of the City centre. I consider that there is a reasonable prospect that if allocated for housing these sites would make a significant contribution to the Plan’s growth strategy.’ (Paragraph 3.175)

3.6 Consequently, the site is put forward for a residential development of up to 850 units, which is considered particularly appropriate due to the previously developed status of the land, the highly accessible sustainable location of the site and the need to secure the best and most efficient use of the land.

3.7 The UDP Inspectors report concluded at paragraph 5.62 that the site need not be developed together with the adjacent Whitehead Works site. This was also the conclusion of leading Counsel, having advised Network Rail prior to the submission of the current application for up to 850 houses.

3.8 Consequently, the site is promoted as a single allocation as it is clearly capable of being developed independently of any other sites.

4.0 Highways

4.1 The proposal includes the creation of a new access road to the development, to the north of the site, off Cardiff Road. A Transport Assessment has been undertaken for the proposed development of the site. This assessment has indicated that the existing highway is capable of accommodating 850 residential units. The proposed access off Cardiff Road will ensure that the site is suitable for the proposed development and is able to achieve the scale anticipated.

5.0 Other Assessments

5.1 A detailed Flood Consequence Assessment has been undertaken for the site, which confirmed that the majority of the site is within Zone B (as defined in TAN 15). In relation to tidal and fluvial flooding, the requirements of TAN 15 have been fulfilled and consequently, the site is suitable for residential development.

5.2 An Ecological Appraisal and Phase II Survey report have also been carried out for the site. This has shown that the site is neither covered nor immediately adjacent to any statutorily or non-statutorily designated sites. It is acknowledged however that the site is located within 5 km of both the River Usk SAC and the Severn Estuary SPA and Ramsar site, as well as SSSIs at River Usk, Severn Estuary and Gwent Levels. Despite the proximity of the site to these nature conservation areas, the local hydrological regime is such that the proposed development would not have a significant effect on them.

5.3 In relation to habitats, mature trees and flora and fauna on the site, it is anticipated that none of these would be affected by the proposed development. In relation to reptiles, a mitigation strategy has been recommended. Detailed survey work in relation breeding birds, flora and invertebrates has confirmed that they will not constrain development provided works are undertaken to existing habitats and the species located within are effectively managed.
5.4 A detailed ‘Ground Investigation Works and Reclamation Strategy Report’ has been produced, which confirmed that there are no fundamental constraints on development.

5.5 Consequently, the assessments undertaken have shown that there is no major constraints on the site and that the site is suitable for the proposed residential development.

6.0 Planning Case

6.1 The Wales Spatial Plan 2008 update provides a long term vision for shaping future plans for the people of Wales.

6.2 The plan aims to provide sustainable communities throughout South East Wales and states that:

‘At the heart of the vision is a network of strong, sustainable communities spreading prosperity from the two major centres of Cardiff and Newport to valleys across the region.’ (p127)

6.3 Newport is located within the South East Wales Capital Network, and is considered to be one of fourteen key settlements which have been agreed and independently validated as having a critical role to play in the success of the Capital region. In relation to building sustainable communities:

‘At the heart of the vision is a network of strong, sustainable communities spreading prosperity from the two major centres of Cardiff and Newport to valleys across the region’. (p127).

6.4 In addition Newport is located within the City and Coast sub-area where the pattern of housing development is considered as follows:

‘The City and Coast provides a superb environment in which to live. The pressure to provide more housing and employment should be managed so as to fit in compatibly with conservation of the landscape, environment and community strength of this area. Substantial growth of housing in the coastal zone should also be compatible with the health of housing markets in the Heads of the Valleys and Connections Corridor.’ (p130).

6.5 In the light of the Wales Spatial Plan, a regional housing apportionment process has been undertaken for South East Wales by the South East Wales Strategic Planning Group (SEWSPG). Although these figures are not targets, they will provide a context for the preparation of LDP’s. For Newport, assumed average dwelling completions for 2006-2021 are currently expected to be 800 per annum to meet identified targets. This figure represents a 90% increase in the dwelling completions for 1991 – 2005 and as such, highlights the increased requirement for residential development within the forthcoming Newport LDP.

6.6 Consequently, there is a need to identify strategic sites for housing land as part of the LDP process. This site will provide a sustainable, brownfield location which is suitable and available to accommodate the new housing development required.

7.0 Conclusions

7.1 It is our contention that within the next plan period, (the Local Development Plan) the site is suitable and capable of being allocated and developed for residential uses, as a single, independent allocation for approx 850 houses.

7.2 The development of the site will bring significant benefits to Newport and the wider Capital region, and will provide essential new residential developments.

7.3 The site has the following major benefits:

- It is located on a previously developed, brownfield site.
- The site is in a sustainable, accessible location, close to the city centre and a number of public transport links.
- The site has low flood risk.
- The site will be served via access from Cardiff Road.
- The site does not exhibit any fundamental constraints to development.
- The site is suitable, available and able to deliver the proposed residential development.
- There is significant potential for the provision of linkages to the surrounding areas.

7.4 In terms of site specific issues, detailed assessment has established that the site is not subject to any major constraints which would restrict the site from being developed (e.g.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>198.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site Proposal for up to 850 residential units at Monbank Sidings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

physical characteristics, accessibility and location, environmental constraints and opportunities, infrastructure issues and site availability). As such, the site is considered to be suitable, available and deliverable to undertake the proposed development within the plan period.

7.5 The site therefore should be allocated for residential development within the proposed LDP.

Question: 9 Map Included?

Representation Text: Yes.
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224 Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd Agent: RPS Group PLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 56/ Sainsbury’s New Site

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Residential and Hotel Development on existing Sainsbury’s site.

---

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
In addition to the highway works proposed as part of the scheme, it is recommended that it includes improvements to sustainable transport including walking and cycling and public transport improvements.
It is recommended that no sleeping accommodation is provided on the ground floor of development.
Close to SAC, SINC and SSSI- it should be ensured that the development and any associated works and traffic will not lead to negative effects on the environmental designations or their occupants in accordance with the River’s Edge Strategy.
It should be ensured that the encouragement of public accessibility to the river does not compromise its features in terms of its environmental designation.

---

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Shaftsbury. Planning permission was granted subject to a Section 106 agreement (currently unsigned) by Newport City Council in 2009. It is recommended that the site is allocated as a residential commitment in the Local Development Plan.

---

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Site of Sainsbury’s Supermarket

---

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Usk Way, Newport. NP20 5YA.

---

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** 331197 188707

**Council Response:** 331197 188707

---

**Question:** 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** 2.12 ha

---

**Question:** 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** The site is 2.12 hectares (5.25 acres) in size and is currently occupied by a Sainsbury’s Supermarket, back up areas, car park and a petrol filling station. The existing store is extremely constrained within its current site and is unable to meet the full demands of its catchment population.

---

**Question:** 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:** Retail Store (Food)
### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:** Residential and Hotel Development.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Retail Superstore.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:** Redevelopment of a brownfield site within an existing urban area. Riverside location would result in site being viable from the otherside of the river and river crossings, including railway.

**Council Response:** Countryside Comments:
- Infringes onto valuable area of countryside River Usk SSSI & Proposed SLA 4
- Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts on river edge landscaping Area of High value in LANDMAP.
- Public open space Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:** No. There are trees around the periphery of the site. They are not protected.

**Council Response:** TPO 7 of 2009 covers the trees.

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:** Redevelopment of the site will provide opportunities to introduce further landscaping and garden areas and improve public accessibility to the river.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:** Redevelopment of the site will provide opportunities to introduce further landscaping and garden areas and improve public accessibility to the river.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment:
- Site of Medieval Mill.
- Restraint. Archaeological assessment produced. Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. No reason for not allocating in LDP

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Site for Residential and Hotel Development on existing Sainsbury's site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td>Yes. Soil contamination is due to historical use of the site (environmental controls to mitigate potential impacts will be used, where appropriate).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Flood Risk?</td>
<td>Yes. Site lies partially in Zone C1 &amp; Zone B. Raising ground levels within the site where appropriate will be considered in any future development proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td>Yes. River Usk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 SSSI?</td>
<td>Yes. Adjacent to River Usk SAC and SSSI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Protected Species?</td>
<td>No. None likely to be on site, River Usk likely to act as a wildlife corridor. With appropriate mitigation, development of site need not effect habitats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Listed building n/a&lt;br&gt;Ancient monuments n/a&lt;br&gt;Historic park n/a&lt;br&gt;Conservation area n/a&lt;br&gt;Within Newport boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Access to Highway?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes, confirmed in recent planning approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?</td>
<td>Improve and upgrade links along the river.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Hotel Development on existing Sainsbury's site.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Hotel Development on existing Sainsbury's site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Response: The proposed development falls within the Shaftesbury Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.58Ha. The site’s proximity to Shaftesbury Park (Approximately 400m) means that a request for an off-site contribution to upgrade local play facilities would be necessary.

- **Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
  - **Representation Text:** Opportunities to improve links to the town centre bus and train stations.
  - **Council Response:**

- **Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
  - **Representation Text:**
  - **Council Response:** shaftesbury avenue A4042 (site frontage)

- **Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
  - **Representation Text:** Site is within walking distance of Newport City Centre including bus station and train station.
  - **Council Response:** 0-10 mins

- **Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
  - **Representation Text:** Site is within walking distance of Newport City Centre including bus station and train station.
  - **Council Response:** newport 400m

- **Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
  - **Representation Text:** Site is within walking distance of Newport City Centre including bus station and train station.
  - **Council Response:** 400m to city centre

- **Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
  - **Representation Text:** As above.

- **Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
  - **Representation Text:** Opportunity to improve pedestrian links to the town centre.
  - **Council Response:** good flyway and cycle links to city centre and beyond.

- **Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
  - **Representation Text:**
  - **Council Response:** No.

- **Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
  - **Representation Text:** Shaftsbury Park - under 1 mile away.

16/02/2012
Candidate Site for Residential and Hotel Development on existing Sainsbury's site. Pugsley Street play area is just to the north, and Shaftesbury Park is a further 200m to the north of the site.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Crindau Primary School, Ailesbury Street, Newport.

**Council Response:**

Crindau Primary School about 900m to the north.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**

No. Not specifically, although its redevelopment to residential by Newport Unlimited in its documentation.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**

Development would make effective use of the site once the existing Sainsbury's Store has relocated to the Crindau Regeneration Area. Residential and Hotel development would accord with adjacent residential area.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:**

Site is currently adequately serviced.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Council Response:**

We have provided comment previously on the proposed development sites within this catchment, in particular the proposed Crindau Gateway redevelopment. As we have advised, it is unlikely that the existing public sewerage system can accommodate the sewerage flows that would be generated by this proposed development. As such it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately. However, we have also advised that subject to removal of surface water from the public combined sewerage system we may be in a position to consider further communication of foul flows with the public sewerage system. A suitable condition has been incorporated within the planning consent for this development site to protect our position.

**Water supply**

We have advised previously that a water supply can be provided to serve the Crindau Sainsburys's store and the residential development located on former Sainsbury's site. It has also been highlighted that a water supply can be made to serve the large Crindau Gateway development however, this would be subject to consideration of the proposed future site layout and usage. In the event that the water mains local to the development cannot adequately supply the site the developer may need to contribute to the provision of off site water mains as
Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Hotel Development on existing Sainsbury's site.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text:

No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text:

Site is located within the settlement limits and is well related to nearby residential developments. Site is well served by existing utilities and community infrastructure and facilities.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text:

.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

Representation Text:

Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

Representation Text:

N/A

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

Representation Text:

No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Hotel Development on existing Sainsbury's site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.4** Restrictive Covenants?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5** Realistic Timescale?

Representation Text: Yes. 1-3 years.

**Question: 7.6** Development Boundary Change?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.7** Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: CONSTRUCTION OF PETROL FILLING STATION 90/0675 09/11/2009 Refused (allowed at appeal) 01/05/1991

**Question: 7.8** Planning Application Refusals?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9** Planning Applications Pending?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8** Other Information?

Representation Text: . Please refer to covering letter.

Existing Sainsbury’s Supermarket Site, Usk Way

The site is 2.12 hectares (5.25 acres) in size and is currently occupied by a Sainsbury’s Supermarket, back up areas, car park and a petrol filling station. As you are aware, the existing store is extremely constrained within its current site and is unable to meet the full demands of its catchment population. Sainsbury’s Supermarket is therefore currently pursuing its desire to relocate to the Former Gas Works Site on Albany Street, therefore freeing up the existing site for residential development purposes.

The site is located within the urban settlement boundary, as defined by the Newport Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and is sustainably located being within easy walking distance the Town Centre, bus station and railway station (on the Swansea to London main line) via a footbridge over the A4042. The surrounding land comprises a residential area to the north, with the Crindau regeneration area beyond, a mixture of residential, retail and civic uses to the west, the retailcommercial heart of Newport to the south and the River Usk to the east.

The site is capable of being adequately accessed and serviced from Usk Way and contains no listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Statutory or Local landscape or nature conservation designations. The Development Advice Maps indicate that site is located within Zone C1 which is defined as being an area of floodplain served by significant infrastructure including flood defences.

It is therefore considered that the residential allocation of the site is highly appropriate in this location. The development will make a contribution to the range of residential accommodation available within Newport in a highly sustainable location. The site is located at the edge of the Town Centre and accordingly is accessible to a multiplicity of facilities. The site is also...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Hotel Development on existing Sainsbury’s site.

accessible by both private and public transport. The development will therefore have positive socio-economic impacts on the area and would further support the continued redevelopment of the city centre and Crindau regeneration area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 9</th>
<th>Map Included?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Retail use on former Gasworks site at Crindau (outline consent given).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA Recommendation</td>
<td>In addition to the highway works proposed as part of the scheme, it is recommended that it includes improvements to sustainable transport including walking and cycling and public transport improvements. It is recommended that no sleeping accommodation is provided on the ground floor of development. Close to SAC, SINC and SSSI- it should be ensured that the development and any associated works and traffic will not lead to negative effects on the environmental designations or their occupants in accordance with the River’s Edge Strategy. It should be ensured that the encouragement of public accessibility to the river does not compromise its features in terms of its environmental designation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Overall Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Response: The proposed use for the site has been fully implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.1</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Former Gas Works Site, Crindau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.2</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Albany Street, Newport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.3</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>331170 189622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.4</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>5.69 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.5</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Rep’n/Para/Policy** 224.C2  
**AccessnNo** 06/05/2009  
**DateLodgd** P  
**Late?** P  
**Source** W  
**Mode** M  
**Summary** Candidate Site for Retail use on former Gasworks site at Crindau (outline consent given).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant land and buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retail (food and non food). Site already benefits from outline planning consent for retail development / mixed use scheme (ref: 02/1414).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Brownfield?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Former Gas works site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Agricultural Land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site forms part of Crindau Regeneration Area and Development will accord with Newport City Council’s policy objectives for the site and surrounding area. Existing surroundings are urban/industrial. Site is fairly visually contained although fleeting views are afforded by passing cars on A4042. Countryside Comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape &amp; countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Trees and Hedgerows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Mature trees on site, none of which are the subject of TPO's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No trees site currently being developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Archaeology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Retail use on former Gasworks site at Crindau (outline consent given).

**Representation:**
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Former Gasworks. Archaeological evaluation carried out. Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Soil contamination due historical use of site. Significant remediation has taken place in recent years (further environmental controls to mitigate potential impacts will be used, where appropriate).

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Site located in zone C1. Raising of site levels would remove site from flood risk without unacceptable impact on third parties.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Site is only about 100m from the River Usk SAC and SSSI.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Listed building n/a
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park n/a
  - conservation area n/a
  - Within Newport boundary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Retail use on former Gasworks site at Crindau (outline consent given).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. It is vital to note that by accessing site from A4042 (providing link with Albany Street) access will be opened up to whole of the Crindau Regeneration Area.

**Council Response:**
- Yes proved by t.a.
- Subject to planning approval.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** Development of site would aid delivery of the Regeneration of the Crindau Area.

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Shaftesbury Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.58Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** Development of site would aid delivery of the Regeneration of the Crindau Area.

See Qu 4.7

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** c600m (Brynglas Avenue and Malpas Road)

**Council Response:** malpas rd/ shaftsbury avenue 600m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** 10 services run via the above stops at frequencies of 30 mins to 1 hour.

**Council Response:** 0-10 mins

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:** Newport Station - 1 mile

**Council Response:** newport

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:** Site is located approx 1 mile from Newport City Centre. Development of site would include a convenience store.

**Council Response:** malpas rd, sainsburys store etc.
- n/a retail development.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

16/02/2012
### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

**Representation Text:** Improving / Upgrading pedestrian links across the Regeneration Area, including under A4042 and along Aragon Street.

**Council Response:**
- Existing flyway infrastructure links to N.C.N

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?

**Representation Text:** Shaftsbury Park - approx 0.5 miles away

### Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Crindau Primary School adjacent.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Site forms part of the Crindau Regeneration area and already benefits from outline planning consent for a mixed use/ Retail development (Ref:021414)

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:** Site forms part of the Crindau Regeneration area and already benefits from outline planning consent for a mixed use/ Retail development (Ref:021414)

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:** Site can be adequately serviced.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:** No. Redevelopment would improve situation in this respect, not least by substantially reducing current HGV movements along Albany Street.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

We have provided comment previously on the proposed development sites within this catchment, in particular the proposed Crindau Gateway redevelopment. As we have advised, it is...
Summary: Candidate Site for Retail use on former Gasworks site at Crindau (outline consent given).

unlikely that the existing public sewerage system can accommodate the sewerage flows that would be generated by this proposed development. As such it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately. However, we have also advised that subject to removal of surface water from the public combined sewerage system we may be in a position to consider further communication of foul flows with the public sewerage system. A suitable condition has been incorporated within the planning consent for this development site to protect our position.

Water supply

We have advised previously that a water supply can be provided to serve the Crindau Sainsbury's store and the residential development located on former Sainsbury’s site. It has also been highlighted that a water supply can be made to serve the large Crindau Gateway development however, this would be subject to consideration of the proposed future site layout and usage. In the event that the water mains local to the development cannot adequately supply the site the developer may need to contribute to the provision of off site water mains as appropriate. We can advise on this matter further following provision of detailed site proposals when available.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

Representation Text: See Question 5.2

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

Representation Text: The provision and access on A4042 would facilitate regeneration of the whole Crindau Regeneration Area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Candidate Site for Retail use on former Gasworks site at Crindau (outline consent given).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Site Owner? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Interest in Adjoining Land? Yes. Redevelopment of the site to accommodate the proposed relocation of the existing Sainsbury's Store at Usk Way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Restrictive Covenants? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Realistic Timescale? Yes. Start Date Within 1-3 Years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Development Boundary Change? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Unimplemented Planning Permissions? Yes. 02/1414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF GAS HOLDER AND REMEDIAL INFILL WORKS
94/1095 13/01/1995 Granted

RETAIL FOODSTORE WITH ASSOCIATED PETROL FILLING STATION, RETAIL WAREHOUSING, PUBLIC HOUSE, HOTEL, DRIVE THROUGH RESTAURANT, LANDSCAPING, ACCESS AND RELOCATION OF RADIO TOWER
02/1376 17/10/2002 (received) In Abeyance
No information available

MIXED-USE REGENERATION SCHEME COMPRISING CLASS A1 RETAIL WAREHOUSING; A CLASS A3 RESTAURANT; CLASS C3 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND SERVICING AND A NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS OFF THE A4042 CONNECTING INTO THE WIDER CRINDAU URBAN REGENERATION AREA (OUTLINE APPLICATION)
02/1411 30/04/2008 Withdrawn
No information available

MIXED-USE REGENERATION SCHEME COMPRISING A RE-LOCATED SAINSBURYS SUPERMARKET (CLASS A1) WITH AN ANCILLARY RESTAURANT/COFFEE SHOP AND PETROL FILLING STATION; A CLASS A3 RESTAURANT; CLASS C3 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND SERVICING AND A NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS OFF THE A4042 CONNECTING INTO THE WIDER CRINDAU URBAN REGENERATION AREA (OUTLINE APPLICATION)
02/141424/04/2008 Granted with conditions (S106 sealed)
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Following the receipt of additional information, the Agency has no objections to the proposed scheme subject to the following matters being imposed as planning conditions:-

- building to be constructed at a minimum level of 9.44m AOD;
- car parking to be constructed at a minimum level of 8.84m AOD;
- surface water from the site to be discharged to a Dwr Cymru surface water sewer with attenuation provided on site designed to a 1 in 100 years standard;
- emergency access to and egress from the site to be provided by the proposed access ramp;
- flood bank/noise bund to be provided adjacent to Glassworks Cottage.

It is essential that the remediation strategy regarding contaminated land is commensurate with the development proposed for each particular location. The Environmental Statement identifies that risk assessments have been undertaken, and demonstrate that the risk to controlled waters of the River Usk and Crindu Pill were not significant. However, this relates to the current state of the site and would need to be updated to relate to the proposals for redevelopment. The Agency, therefore, requires that a detailed scheme for supplementary investigation and recording of contamination be undertaken, together with a risk assessment. This Method Statement should include details of the remediation strategy, its impact on the site layout together with measures to be implemented if unexpected areas of contamination are discovered. There is also a requirement for a groundwater monitoring scheme, as well as details of the method of piling foundations. It is the construction phase which poses the greatest risk to controlled works, and, therefore, suitable prevention measures will need to be agreed to minimise potential impact. This will require the preparation of a detailed Method Statement, and this will need to cover details of all oil, fuel and chemical storage facilities; details of surface water run-off arrangements; no pollution discharges from haul roads and disturbed areas, and details of imported material.

Details for the disposal of foul water also needs to be agreed. The applicant also needs to be informed that the petrol filling station and associated works should be of double skinned construction to conform with the EC Groundwater Directive. Oils and chemicals need to be stored in a properly bunded area, and oil interceptors need to be provided in drainage of parking areas and hardstandings. All foul drainage must be disposed of so that it does not contaminate the area, and this would preferably be to the foul sewer.

The proposed development is in proximity to the River Usk, cSAC and SSSI, and the Council must undertake an assessment of the likely significant effect of the works on the interests of the site. Japanese Knotweed is present on site and details of the methods for its eradication and control need to be considered.

The site may contain species or habitats included in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan or Local Biodiversity Action Plan, and consideration should be given to the preservation or enhancement of these. The site may be used by bats, and these are protected species. The Agency welcomes the suggestion that bat boxes may be incorporated into buildings on the development. Would encourage the retention of mature trees for their conservation and aesthetic value. Any removal of trees should be undertaken in such a way as to protect breeding birds. Any landscape plans should include native species to increase the biodiversity value of the site.

It is the applicant’s responsibility to ensure that the development will not affect any existing water interests in the area. Any culverting of a watercourse requires prior written approval. WELSH ASSEMBLY GOVERNMENT TRANSPORT DIRECTORATE: A number of meetings have been held with the developers traffic consultant and all the outstanding matters relating to the Transport Assessment have been resolved. Satisfied that the highway improvements proposed for the A4042 trunk road roundabout at Grove Park and Heidenheim Drive adequately mitigate the effects of the increased traffic generated by the proposed development. However, in order to ensure the free flow and safety to the trunk road, would advise that all high

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH): The sites previous use as a gas works raises some obvious concerns with regards to ground contamination. The submitted environmental statement acknowledges that further work needs to be undertaken before work can commence on site. However, the ground investigatory work done to date gives a basic understanding of the degree of contamination, although it is restricted to a certain degree by the number of buildings on site.

It will, therefore, be necessary to undertake a site investigation that covers all areas of the site having particular regard to the previous use. A condition requiring the ground investigation should, therefore, be attached to any planning consent granted. This should include a full quantitative risk assessment, with a suitable remediation strategy being formulated on the basis of this assessment.

Conditions should also be attached to any consent granted to ensure that existing residents’ health is not prejudiced and they are not subject to environmental nuisance. This would involve the preparation of a Management Plan which would need to be approved by the Local Planning Authority, and involve details of dust suppression measures, access for site traffic, control of noise, hours of operation, piling scheme, monitoring of noise and vibration and appointment of an Environmental Liaison Officer. Details of noise mitigation works would also need to be approved.
SUSTRANS: Considers that the scheme as it stands, would be detrimental to the City Centre as the relocation of the Sainsbury Store would remove it from a central location and make it less accessible. It would also bring more traffic to a residential area and encourage out of town shopping with more private car trips. Although the Planning Statement make reference to the importance of pedestrian permeability and sustainable transport, the submitted plans show no alternative access to the site other than the new ramped access onto the A4042. The development turns its back onto the new residential development in Aragon Street and to the pedestrian subway linking with Brynglas Avenue. Any layout should, therefore, provide better linkages and improvement of the existing subway. An alternative link for pedestrians and cyclists should also be provided into the development from Albany Street. Secure cycle parking facilities should be located near the store. The National Cycle Network Route 47 passes close to the site at its southern end and links should be made to this. The proposed junction of the new access road and the A4042, as well as the ramp are extremely hazardous for cyclists, and there needs to be a major improvement in this aspect of the scheme, as well as at the new roundabout on Albany Street. Traffic calming will be required along Albany Street and Lyne Road, as this will be the main access route for cyclists approaching from the City Centre.

GLAMORGAN Gwent Archaeological Trust: Agree with the contents of the Environmental Statement regarding the likely archaeological resource and the impact of the development on it. The analysis demonstrates that any archaeological features that existed in the site will have been severely degraded by the last user of the site. Therefore, it is unlikely that any features of more than local importance will be affected by the proposed development. One possible area where more important archaeological features could survive has been identified on the course of the former Crindau Pill. However, the proposed layout does not show any buildings in this area which could require deep foundations. There are, therefore, no objections on archaeological grounds to the application being approved. However, would recommend that a condition be attached to any consent granted requiring that a programme of archaeological work be agreed.

DWR Cymru: Foul and surface water should be discharged separately from the site, and no surface water or land drainage run-off should discharge to the public sewerage system. Suitable grease traps must be provided in the new system. If the development gives rise to a new discharge of trade effluent then a discharge consent is required. No problems are envisaged with the waste water treatment works for the discharge of domestic water. A water supply can be made to the new development. The proposed development is crossed by a trunk/distributor water main.

Countryside Council for Wales: Provided concerns are addressed through appropriate planning conditions or agreement would have no objections to the scheme. Main concern relates to the lack of any reference to the requirements of the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994. The first step when considering the implications of the proposal is whether it is likely to have a significant effect on the cSAC, with an appropriate assessment being the second step. In this instance of the opinion that provided no contaminated discharge is released into the River Usk during the construction and operation of the development, the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect on the River Usk cSAC. With respect to the SSSI, the main concerns are the same as for the cSAC. In principle, therefore, it should be possible to address concerns through the implementation of appropriate planning conditions.

Newport Unlimited: The area of Crindau falls within the scope of the Central Area Masterplan. Newport Unlimited supports the principle of locating a superstore in the City Centre, but should this not come forward, a relocated Sainsbury on this site, together with a “basket” shopping facility within the City Centre would seem acceptable. A relocated Sainsbury Store could provide two benefits, involving a new high quality access into Crindau which would help facilitate the regeneration of the wider area. The second benefit would be by removing Sainsbury from its present location, there would be significant improvements in terms of alleviating traffic pressure on the Old Green roundabout, but this would be dependant upon the extinguishment of the retail consent at this location. The design of the store is important, and this should be innovative and demonstrate proper regard to the wider surroundings. Design of the roof scape is important due to the elevated highway and gateway nature of the site. Good quality frontage into the street would be expected adding interest and character to the area. Generally support the principle of residential development, and new infill development could help strengthen the existing fragmented residential uses. Would favour medium to high density development that will reinforce the urban character of the area. Permeability should be maximised by promoting safe direct routes for walking and cycling; and public space should be active and overlooked. Poorly integrated public space next to the pedestrian subway could become a hub for anti social behaviour. Generally support the concept of creating a new vehicular access off the A4042, and opportunities to provide new connections between Crindau and the major north/south roadway are investigated in the Masterplan. It is appropriate to consider the site in its wider context. Proposed development should maintain flexibility for future development uses such as a marina development. Proposals for this site should consider the urbanised setting in which it exists and seek to create a vibrant mixed use community in a high quality urban landscape.

Education and Leisure: Local Primary School is at capacity, and comprehensive is above capacity. Education contribution is, therefore, required to upgrade education provision.
Local playing facility is in need of upgraded play equipment, and contribution towards this should also be requested.

USE OF SITE FOR METAL RECYCLING AND SCRAP METAL MERCHANTS
92/0399 08/03/1993 Granted Basement

PROVISION OF BUILDING FOR LABORATORY TESTING IN ASSOCIATION WITH ROAD CONSTRUCTION
99/0658 06/08/1999 Granted with conditions Basement

MIXED USE REGENERATION OF SITE INCLUDING RESIDENTIAL, STUDENT ACCOMMODATION, AND SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION FOR THE ELDERLY (CLASSES C2 AND C3); AN HOTEL (CLASS C1); COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS AND OFFICES (CLASS B1); A LOCAL CENTRE INCLUDING RETAIL, LEISURE AND HEALTHCARE FACILITIES (CLASSES A1, A2, A3, D1 AND D2); AND ASSOCIATED HIGHWAY AND FLOOD DEFENCE WORKS. (ACCOMPANIED BY AN ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT)
07/1322 23/10/2007 (received) Awaiting S106

HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: The current highway capacity is insufficient to support the maximum number of dwellings assumed in the submitted Transport Assessment. Further analysis has been undertaken on behalf of the Council to ascertain what the maximum number of residential units would be and has been determined that the UDP estimated allocation of 420 units would be the upper limit. A condition to restrict the residential element of the development to this figure is therefore necessary. A financial contribution towards improvements to the Lyne Road Bridge junction to enable buses to access the site and to reflect the regeneration of the area is required along with any land necessary to achieve this. In order to pump prime a bus service which would then be available to early occupants of the development (first five years from first occupation) before the service became self-sustaining a financial contribution of £250,000 would be required.

HEAD OF EDUCATION (RESOURCES AND PLANNING): Additional provision for primary and secondary schools to accommodate additional children resulting from new families moving into the proposed development may be required depending on the number and mix of residential units proposed for the site.

HEAD OF CONTINUING LEARNING AND LEISURE: Provision for formal and informal play space and equipped/designated play space is required through a combination of on-site provision and contributions towards off-site facilities.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Contaminated Land
The proposed development site encompasses a number of recent and historic land uses that are likely to have caused potential contamination. There are also some concerns regarding the migration of mobile contaminants from the adjacent former Crindau gasworks site, in the direction of the River Usk. Therefore conditions are recommended in the event that planning permission is granted requiring contamination investigation and mitigation and restrictions on imported soil materials.

Noise
Conditions recommended in the event that planning permission is granted to ensure adequate protection from noise to existing residents during construction and to prospective residents once the development is operational including noise impact assessment. A condition requiring details of piling methods is also recommended in terms of noise and disturbance to existing residents.

DWR CYMRU – WELSH WATER. A surface water trade off based on the details submitted is acceptable. On the basis that the surface water will be removed from the system, DCWW do not raise objection. However, before DCWW can approve a connection of the foul flow from the development they will need to...
GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: No in principle objection. Fully support the commitment to replacing and creating habitat, particularly the reed bed and scrub. Also support the commitment to enhancing the area for protected species and to improving biodiversity in general. Concern is raised that the mitigation measures for bats do not refer to the negative impact of lighting on foraging bats. This can be easily mitigated by controlling direction, extent and timing of lighting.

GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: The main area of archaeological potential is alongside Crindau Pill but due to health and safety issues and the tidal conditions it is acknowledged that an archaeological evaluation of this area is not possible prior to determination of this planning application. However, there would be a requirement for a programme of archaeological investigation in the event that planning permission was granted together with mitigation measures in the event that significant archaeological features are discovered. There is no objection to the application on the basis of the initial information provided but this is subject to a condition to ensure that a programme of archaeological investigation is implemented.

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: In terms of the possible impacts on the integrity of the River Usk Special Area of Conservation (SAC) CCW raised concerns pending an appropriate assessment carried out by NCC. These concerns related to possible discharge of contaminants with potential resultant impacts on protected fish and otters; potential disturbance to otters and migrating fish; loss and/or obstruction of otter habitat/movement corridors; that future proposals for a marina, locks and canal link could jeopardise the viability of mitigation proposals for the current planning application. CCW have now seen the appropriate assessment carried out by NCC and consider that provided the conditions are fully implemented any adverse impacts on the SAC would be avoided. CCW therefore raise no objection to the proposals in terms of impact on the SAC. CCW also recommend that in relation to bats, habitat associated with bat flightlines is retained and that lighting is sympathetic which should be controlled by conditions.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Raise no objections of flooding grounds subject to mitigation works being carried out in accordance with the principles of the Flood Consequences Assessment (FCA) and FCA Addendum and subject to detailed flood mitigation design calculations being submitted at the reserved matters stage. These calculations will ultimately provide the required mechanisms that should be implemented to effectively manage flood risk. The flood alleviation works would result in edge treatment constructed to a level of 9.08 metres above ordnance datum (AOD) which is predicted to guard against a 1 in 1000 year extreme stillwater tide level in year 2054. In terms of biodiversity issues initial concerns over the potential detrimental impact on natural riverbank habitat have been addressed through the submission of the Development Framework including a River’s Edge Strategy (amongst other things this states that a 7 metre buffer would be established and maintained along the edge of the Pill and maximising the use of bank reprofiling and ‘soft’ engineering mechanisms such as timber cribs rather than hard approaches such as sheet piling). The EA also consider that it is positive that ecological issues have been put at the forefront in developing the River’s Edge Strategy and state that it is critical that the recommendations in the Ecology section are followed. The EA request that they be able to comment on the proposed ‘Management Plan’ referred to in the Development Framework and would also wish to see reference to concerns about impact on fish relating to timing of construction and possible impact on migrating fish covered in that document.
In terms of potential contamination of the River Usk Special Area of Conservation (SAC) this is regarded as a high priority site because of the sensitivity of groundwater as a pathway to the river. Conditions are therefore recommended requiring detailed reports to ensure controlled waters are adequately protected.

A number of conditions relating to ecological, flooding and contamination issues are recommended.

### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Comments in relation to emergency access in the event of flooding:**

**Police**

Only observation is that if the administration of the proposed flood barrier is not maintained, any flood water getting through would primarily flood in the area where the proposed emergency access would be (ie between Malpas Road and Albany Street beneath Heidenheim Way). According to the projected flood mapping we have, the junction of Albany Road and Agincourt Street, outside the club, is a flood area.

**Ambulance**

No reservations about emergency access / egress (ie between Malpas Road and Albany Street beneath Heidenheim Way) for the outline approval stage and are happy that with some work their vehicles would travel the route easily.

**Fire Service**

Whilst the Fire Service would not be entirely dependent on vehicular access during the identified 2 hour timeframe in a flood situation, this may not be the case in a fire situation and vehicular access would be required to cover all eventualities i.e. if a fire ensued in premises within the flooded area at the same time, this being a worst case scenario of course. Agree that the emergency access route identified (ie between Malpas Road and Albany Street beneath Heidenheim Way) is wide enough for appliance access and egress, subject to the necessary works being undertaken as identified by the applicant (the applicant has identified that the existing bank of steps would need to be removed and replaced with rising bollards and that the exact design and mechanism of this would need to be agreed with Newport City Council at detailed design stage).

**MONMOUTHSHIRE BRECON AND ABERGAVENNY CANALS TRUST:** Refer to DETR document ‘Waterways for Tomorrow’ which follows up the White Paper A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone by setting out proposals for the future of our inland waterways. The Government is committed to encouraging navigation authorities like Newport City Council to work with waterways agencies to provide a higher quality and more joined up experience for users especially where new waterside developments are proposed. Trust members do not oppose the development but wish the Council to ensure:

- that the development maintains a clear open space of at least 15 metres between new buildings and service and emergency access roads to allow for future development of the water space for a marina and on water activities (this land can be used as a green corridor with integrated pedestrian and cycle access); and
- that any river bank reventment works take into account the natural wildlife corridor by providing wildlife refuges, and that the design and construction is to a standard which is environmentally attractive and can support the installation of landing gangways from the marina’s floating pontoons to the pedestrian footpath, cycleway and access road.

**R J MASON TRANSPORT AND W HAROLD JOHN (METALS) LIMITED** (both of whom are current occupiers of the site) urge a favourable decision as soon as possible to enable them to programme their business accordingly.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Site for Retail use on former Gasworks site at Crindau (outline consent given).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owners of units 5-7 Waterside Court, Albany Street raise overall support for the application but raise some detailed comments to be taken into consideration as follows:

- The development could not be supported through the existing access from Harlequin Roundabout via Albany Street where cars parked on both sides reduce it to one lane. Increased residential use would exacerbate existing queues leaving the area in rush hour. The development should therefore only go ahead with the proposed new access from Heidenheim Way (the access approved in connection with outline planning permission for Sainsbury on the former gas works site, north of Albany Street).
- Would object to any access to the hotel from the unadopted road of Waterside Court;
- Waterside Court units should be able to acquire the land between them and the Riverside Walk to enable maintenance and use as a buffer to the public area. Without protection of their boundaries security of these units will be made worse.
- Also would want undertaking from the developer that the operation/use of the Waterside Court units would not be disrupted by construction activity.

Occasional of 8 Waterside Court, Albany Street support the regeneration but are concerned about the current access (in the absence of the proposed new access off Heidenheim Way associated with the proposed Sainsbury development) and the effect the construction traffic would have in the short term and the added daily traffic in the long term exacerbating existing problems with access to the Harlequin roundabout. Also concerned about the school crossing on the cross road with Lyne Road due to additional heavy goods traffic negotiating the cross road and the narrow Albany Street to the potential detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.

NEIGHBOURS: One letter received expressing the view that it would not be in the interest of elderly people if student accommodation were to be built alongside sheltered housing for the elderly due to potential noise and disturbance from students.

DESIGN COMMISSION FOR WALES: The Panel was pleased to see these positive proposals for a highly visible area in need of regeneration. DCFW found the principle of the proposal acceptable but did not have sufficient information to give a full assessment. However, the following comments were made:

- A full masterplan study should be required containing clearly stated aspirations with a means of delivery based on codes and planning guidance, but with some inbuilt flexibility designed to encourage ambition (note: since the application was presented to DCFW the applicant has submitted a Development Framework document);
- Remain to be convinced that the relatively high density proposed is appropriate and sustainable. It may be that a lower rise scheme with less dominant parking, would be preferable;
- Would like to see more family housing included;
- Thinks that small starter industrial units should be offered, and possibly some existing employment uses continued;
- Applaud the commitment to retain and build on the existing street structure, although think that the main entrance to the site may need revising;
- Suggest that basement or undercroft parking options be explored;
- Would like to see the development of courtyard blocks explored as a way of dealing with rear boundaries;
- Would like to see the inclusion of live/work units and a district heating system in a revised and expanded masterplan;
- The presentation to DCFW would have benefited from a single site analysis plan, and site sections. The usefulness of the model was undermined by its illustrative nature;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Site for Retail use on former Gasworks site at Crindau (outline consent given).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?  
Representation Text: No.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Retail use on former Gasworks site at Crindau (outline consent given).

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text:
- Please refer to covering letter.
- Former Gas Works Site, Albany Street
- The site is some 5.69 hectares (14.04 acres) in size and comprises the former British Gas Works site which was decommissioned in 1969. The site lies approximately one mile to the north of Newport City Centre and whilst the site has been largely cleared, a number of vacant office buildings and a set of garages still remain on the site. Access to the site is currently gained off Albany Street.
- The site is capable of being adequately accessed and serviced and contains no listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Statutory or Local landscape or nature conservation designations. The Development Advice Maps indicate that site is located within Zone C1 which is defined as being an area of floodplain served by significant infrastructure including flood defences.
- The site forms part of the wider Crindau regeneration area and currently has consent for a 'Mixed-use regeneration scheme comprising a re-located Sainsbury's supermarket (Class A1) with an ancillary restaurant/coffee shop and petrol filling station; a Class A3 restaurant; Class C3 residential development and public open space together with associated car-parking and servicing; Class A1 retail warehousing and a new vehicular access off the A4042 connecting into the wider Crindau Urban Regeneration Area' (Ref: 02/1414).
- In granting consent for the scheme the Council therefore accept the principle of retail and commercial development of the site plus the creation of a new vehicular entrance to the site via the A4042 which would also provide an invaluable gateway into the Crindau regeneration area as a whole. It is therefore considered that the allocation of the site for retail (food and non-food) and commercial purposes is appropriate.
- Accordingly, the Council is respectfully requested to give due consideration to the allocation of each of the above sites within the LDP. I trust that the enclosed information is sufficient. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information or have any questions in respect of the above.

Question: 9 Map Included?
Representation Text: Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site at West Newport for B1, B2, B8 and ancillary commercial uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: SA Recommendation**

It is recommended that only the previously developed sites are considered for development. Development in the ASA should be avoided where possible. Public open space should be provided as part of development, especially where development includes residential provision or employment. It should be ensured that there will be no net increase in surface water runoff as a result of development to reduce the increased risk of flooding through the development of the greenfield site, especially where this may include sensitive uses such as residential accommodation. It should be ensured that the mix of uses provided on site cover the full range of community services and facilities required within walking distance including those in Table 3.4.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

The candidate site is made up of 5 separate parcels of land. The largest parcel of land and one of the southern parcels of land are to be included in the LDP as part of an employment allocation (Ref Policy EM1(i)), which is considered to be of key importance to Newport and the region. The extent of the allocation has been determined by the proposed Duffryn Link Road, which will form a physical boundary to the allocation. Proposals would need to demonstrate that the national economic benefits of the proposal outweigh the environmental impacts. Conservation and enhancement of the SSSI features will need to be central to the consideration of any strategic proposals for the area. The smallest piece of land shown on the candidate site plan is not to be allocate for employment land and will be covered by the proposed Duffryn Link Road. With regards to the Berryhill Farm Site, this greenfield site is divorced from any other employment uses and is positioned within a proposed Green Wedge. The site forms part of an area of land scored as high value in LANDMAP assessment and is situated within the proposed SLA 1 – Wentlooge Levels. The site at Imperial House, Imperial Way is a developed employment site. There is therefore no need to allocate it as an employment site.

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

Representation Text:

- West Newport

**Question: 2.2 Location**

Representation Text:

- Land south of A48

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

Representation Text:

- ST 283 842

Council Response:

- 327062 184138

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

Representation Text:

- 115 ha

Council Response:

- 102.44ha.
### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:**
Existing Agricultural and allocated employment land.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:**
Mixed use, employment and Greenfield.

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:**
Employment, including B1, B2, B8 and ancillary commercial uses. A masterplan would determine the mix of uses.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Part of site is in existing employment use, the remainder is Greenfield.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Part of the site is in agricultural use. An assessment of the Agricultural Land Classification would be required.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:**
The local landscape is mixed in quality, with some major visual intrusions including existing employment uses and overhead power lines. The site is not visible over a wide area.

**Council Response:**
Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. There are mature trees and hedgerows on the site.

**Council Response:**
TPOs cover various trees including:
- willow, alder, ash, oak, holm oak, sycamore, including 3 multi-stem sycamore

See 140.C1 --same comments.

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**
A comprehensive masterplanning exercise could ensure that the development of the site retains and / or enhances biodiversity and landscape features.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:**
No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust has provided an initial appraisal of part of the area and four sites are recorded on the regional Sites and Monuments Record.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Part of site is Greenfield, and part is in existing employment use or allocated for employment purposes in the adopted UDP.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:** Part of the site is subject to flooding. A detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required.

**Council Response:** Only western site is not C1 flood risk area.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. There are drainage reens within the site boundary.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Part of the site is designated SSSI.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** A detailed assessment would be required as part of a masterplanning exercise.

**Council Response:** There are species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:** Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a

**Council Response:**
### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Significant work has been done to the highway network including the opening of the SDR.

**Council Response:**

- **Site 1:**
  Yes, Church Lane. Substandard access for size of site. No new access onto A48. T.A ro confirm suitability for additional traffic generation.

- **Site 2:**

- **Site 3:**
  Yes. Existing development. Change in use will require assessment.

- **Site 4:**
  No. Site is divorced from any other employment area. Only possible if Duffryn Link is constructed.

- **Site 5:**

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
Comprehensive masterplanning would help to ensure the site was connected to public transport.

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:**
The main bus route is along the A48 although some divert through the Duffryn Estate.

**Council Response:**

- **Site 1:**
  A48- site frontage. 550m- Church Lane.

- **Site 2:**
  A48 site frontage 1.3km

- **Site 3:**
  Pencarn Way- 400m

- **Site 4:**
  Within Newport boundary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site at West Newport for B1, B2, B8 and ancillary commercial uses.

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

*Representation Text:* Up to 3 buses per hour.

*Council Response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10-20 min frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-10 Min frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;10 Min frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10-20 min freq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

*Representation Text:* Newport Station

*Council Response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Newport 6Km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newport 5km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Newport 4km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Newport 7km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

*Representation Text:* There is an Asda on the Duffryn estate.

*Council Response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asda - Duffryn 2.8km</td>
<td>Duffryn shops + P.o 3.6km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asda -Duffryn 1.7km</td>
<td>Duffryn shops 2.6km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asda 1km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
There are existing employment sites at Celtic Springs and Duffryn.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- Comprehensive masterplanning could ensure that opportunities for walking and cycling were fully integrated into the development proposals.

**Council Response:**
- Site 1
  - Pedestrian links to A48. No footways on Duffryn Link or Church Lane. Development to include new infrastructure.

- Site 2
  - No footways on Celtic Way

- Site 3
  - Existing infrastructure

- Site 4
  - Very poor access

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
Yes.

**Council Response:**
- Same PROW as 140 C 1 above

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
Yes. There are schools at Duffryn.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
Yes. The majority of the site would have been subject to public scrutiny as part of the UDP process.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- Public involvement and consultation.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>There are services in close proximity to the site although some upgrading may be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

| Representation Text: | No. |

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

| Representation Text: | Yes. Some upgrading of services may be required. |

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

- Sewerage
  - From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.
  - Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

- Water supply
  - It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.
  - A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

- Sewerage treatment
  - No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

| Representation Text: | Yes. Employment uses are proposed. It is considered that there is sufficient space available within the site to ensure that a suitable buffer could be accommodated to protect the occupiers of the residential accommodation to the east of the site. |

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

<p>| Representation Text: | The area has also experienced significant investment and there are already a number of high profile occupiers in the area. The proposed development would form a natural extension from this development that would be curtailed by existing man made and natural landscape features. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site at West Newport for B1, B2, B8 and ancillary commercial uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The extent of the Welsh Assembly Government’s land ownership is shown on the attached plan.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Due to the level of infrastructure already available, there is a strong possibility that parts of the site could come forward for development in the short term, recognising that it would be subject to the appropriate market demand being in place.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Part of the site is already identified for development in the adopted UDP. This submission also seeks inclusion of land at Berryhill Farm which is currently outside the UDP boundary.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**

2787 SQ.M. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACCOMMODATION IN THE FORM OF TWO NO. SINGLE STOREY AND FOUR NO. TWO STOREY BUILDINGS 94/0916 18-Nov-1994 GC

ERECITION OF NEW INSULATION AND CLADDING MANUFACTURING FACILITY WITH EXTERNAL DELIVERY AND YARD STANDING AREA (CLASS B2 OF THE T&CP (USE CLASSES) ORDER 1987) 07/0560 05-Sep-2007 GC

GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: On the basis of the ecological appraisal submitted, has objected to the application, on the basis that insufficient surveys and assessments of species and habitats have been carried out. The impacts should be viewed in the context of cumulative losses resulting from other schemes. Suitable mitigation and compensation measures should be provided.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Has requested that conditions are imposed regarding contamination and drainage. Based on the flooding consequences assessment submitted, it is accepted that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed, and so no objection is raised subject to a Greenfield restriction of 3.5l/s/ha. Waste must be disposed of satisfactorily, foul drainage disposal should be via the foul sewer and any oil storage tanks should be sited on an impervious base.

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: Has objected to the application and recommends that no decision be made on the application, pending the provision of additional information demonstrating how adverse impact on the Gwent Levels: St Brides Site of Special Scientific Interest and protected species will be avoided during both the construction and operational
phases of the development.

ERECCTION OF 17 DETACHED DWELLINGS
02/0089 13-Mar-2002 GC
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: Access road should be calmed, grass service strip not acceptable for future adoption, should be amended to hard surface.
HYDER CONSULTING. Surface water cannot connect to public sewer system.

DEVELOPMENT OF 25 000 SQ FT SCIENCE/ RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE (CLASS B1 (B) OF THE USE CLASSES ORDER) (CELTIC LAKES)
91/0794 15-Aug-1991 GC

ERECCTION OF 2 NO. OFFICE BUILDINGS
01/1231 07-May-2002 GC

CONSTRUCTION OF 1.4KM OF DUAL CARRIAGEWAY (PART OF SOUTHERN DISTRIBUTOR ROAD - WEST DUFFRYN LINK) INCLUDING 4 ROUNDABOUTS TWO SINGLE CARRIAGEWAY LINKS TO PERCOED LANE AND ASSOCIATED EARTHWORKS INCLUDING THE CULVERTING OF EXISTING REENS, CREATION OF SET
96/0677 24-Sep-1996 GC

CONSTRUCTION OF AN INTEGRATED PLANT FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF TELEVISION MONITORS COLOUR PICTURE AND COLOUR DISPLAY TUBES OTHER ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT (LG ELECTRONICS INC.) A WAFER FABRICATION AND ASSEMBLY PLANT (LGSEMICON CO LTD) INCLUDING ANCILLARY BUILDINGS
96/0663 24-Sep-1996 GC

SECOND PHASE OF TWO STOREY (& PART SEMI BASEMENT) RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT OFFICE INCLUDING LANDSCAPING AND PARKING WORKS
94/0436 01-Jul-1994 GC

REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE FOR PUBLIC HOUSE/RESTAURANT/MOTEL
91/0584 06-Sep-1991 GC

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: 

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text: 

Question: 9 Map Included?
Representation Text: Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Mixed Use at former Whiteheads site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
Mix of uses unknown- should be employment led to balance with the provision of housing on 198.C1; potential effects such as increased traffic levels and noise pollution should be mitigated through the design process.
SINC adjacent; close to SAC (river): It is recommended that the potential negative effects on biodiversity are investigated and mitigated prior to the commencement of development as part of a wider scheme to mitigate the potential of the development of the LDP on sites designated for nature conservation interests.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Pillgwenlly. It is recommended for inclusion within the Local Development Plan for residential use.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Whiteheads

**Council Response:**

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Mendalgief Road / Cardiff Road

**Council Response:**

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 307 867

**Council Response:**

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** 17.6 ha

**Council Response:**

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** Former steelworks

**Council Response:**
Brownfield site that has previously been occupied by Whiteheads steelworks. Currently occupied by some industrial uses.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:** Mixed use, comprising residential, commercial and associated uses.

**Council Response:**

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:** Yes. Former steelworks

**Council Response:**
| Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|----------|----------|--------------------------|
| 232.C2                                        | 06/05/2009 | P        | P        | W        | M       | Summary: Candidate Site for Mixed Use at former Whiteheads site. |

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Representation Text:**
- The site is within the urban area.

**Council Response:** Countryside Comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Trees forming a screen to the adjacent railway, potential TPO.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The redevelopment proposals would provide an opportunity for the integration of the site into the neighbouring green spaces as part of a comprehensive masterplanning process.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Former Steelworks. Restraint. Dependent on design may require archaeological evaluation prior to determination of planning consent. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Due to former industrial use there are some contaminants which include hydrocarbons and railway ballast.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. In small parts.
### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. There is a drainage reen on site.

---

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:**
No.

---

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?

**Representation Text:**
No.

---

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

**Representation Text:**
No.

---

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a

**Council Response:**
Within Newport boundary

---

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The site is accessible from the public highway. A full TIA would be undertaken as part of the masterplanning process.

**Council Response:**
- yes
detail discussion with WAG has been undertaken on master plan.
- Access onto Mendalgief Rd to be linked. Should be considered with Monmouthshire bank sideways as of large site. North and south access required.

---

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
The proposed development falls within the Pillgwenlly Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.19Ha. To meet the needs of the young people associated with this development the provision of a LEAP and LAPs on site will be necessary depending of the commercial/residential mix and the increase in population by the development. Additionally off-site provision to improve the play area at Mendalgief Road and formal play spaces at Pillgwenlly Playing Fields may also be requested.

**Council Response:**
- The site currently divides this part of Newport. Its development would allow for permeability to be established through the site.
- yes
detail discussion with WAG has been undertaken on master plan.
- Access onto Mendalgief Rd to be linked. Should be considered with Monmouthshire bank sideways as of large site. North and south access required.

---

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
By ensuring links are created within the site to enable easy access to public transport facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Bus Route?</td>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Candidate Site for Mixed Use at former Whiteheads site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>There is a major bus route along Cardiff Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>adjacent to site on Cardiff road, mendlagrief Rd d.Doctis way good/excellent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Bus Frequency?</td>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Directed service will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>6 buses per hour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Railway Station?</td>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Newpport station 2 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>1 mile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Convenience Shop?</td>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>There is a supermarket on Cardiff Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>50 metres to Maesglas industrial estate. 600metres to city centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>The site is well located to the city centre and the Royal Gwent Hospital and employment provision is anticipated to form part of the redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Walking and Cycling?</td>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A comprehensive masterplanning process would ensure that walking and cycling were fully integrated into the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>on site infrastructure and facilities linking onto Doctis way cycle lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Open Space?</td>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>There is public open space on the north side of Cardiff Road and it is anticipated that open space would be provided on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Belle Vue Park is across Cardiff Road to the north.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Schools?</td>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Mixed Use at former Whiteheads site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Response: Pillgwenlly Primary School is about 500m.

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

*Representation Text:*

Yes. The site has been the subject of public examination through its inclusion in the adopted UDP.

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

*Representation Text:*

By ensuring continuing involvement through the masterplanning process.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

*Representation Text:*

No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

*Representation Text:*

All services are available on site or in close proximity.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

*Representation Text:*

No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

*Representation Text:*

Some upgrading may be required.

*Council Response:*

Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.
Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Logical Extension?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Precedent Setting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Site Owned by Proposer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Site Owner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Interest in Adjoining Land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Restrictive Covenants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

Representation Text: Yes. A realistic start could be expected within 1-3 years from the start of the LDP period.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

Representation Text: .

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

Representation Text: Yes.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C3</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for employment use at Queensway Meadows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site: 49/ Queensway Meadows**

**New Site**

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: SA Recommendation**

Council Response: It is recommended that this sites is not carried forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:

- Site contains a part of the SSSI, SINC; is close to a SAC and SPA;
- No designated open space for recreation- likely to lead to negative effects, from use of countryside areas for recreation, on designated sites for nature conservation;
- Site contains a listed building: It is recommended that the setting and value of the listed building are enhanced through the development of the site loss of 141ha green space including some valuable agricultural land;
- Increased potential for pollution to land, air, water and noise;
- Flood risk area (C1); and
- Directly adjacent to the Nash/Goldcliff coastal zone historic landscape character area of the Gwent Levels- likely to have a negative effect on the landscape character- site is
**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

The site is a major part of the employment land supply and is proposed to be allocated to the protected line of the new M4.

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:**

Queensway Meadows

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:**

Queensway Meadows Industrial Estate

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**

ST 349 857

**Council Response:** 334540 186065

**Question:** 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:**

94 ha

**Question:** 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:**

Land at and adjacent to Queensway Meadows Industrial Estate

**Question:** 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:**

Vacant and agricultural land

**Question:** 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:**

Employment

**Question:** 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question:** 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question:** 3.11 Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Some of the site is Grade 3B.

---

**characterised including abundant archaeological remains, which may be affected negatively by development adjacent.**
Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
Representation Text: The site would not be highly visible and would be seen against the backdrop of the existing urban fringe of Newport and the Llanwern steelworks.

Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
Representation Text: Yes. There are trees and hedgerows within the site.

Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
Representation Text: Biodiversity and landscape features could included through a comprehensive masterplanning process.

Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
Representation Text: Not known at this stage.
Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area Most southerly part on Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape. Fairly Significant Restraint. Remove most southerly part as it is on Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
Representation Text: Yes. Tan 15 advises that less vulnerable forms of development may be acceptable.
Council Response: All C1 flood risk.

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
Representation Text: Yes. There are drainage reens within the site.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for employment use at Queensway Meadows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:** No. The site has been grouted and piled.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Part of the site is within the Gwent Levels SSSI.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. This would need to be assessed.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building (1 within)
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site would be subject to masterplanning which would include a transport assessment.

**Council Response:**
- Yes meadow rd
- Yes transport assessment required

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- The Llanwern Ward has a shortfall in play space of 1.52Ha. Part of this site includes the Hayley Stadium home of Newport Speedway who contributes to the sporting and physical activity agenda which is increasingly gaining higher profile within the Welsh Assembly Government. The retention of the stadium (site/land) for recreational and tourism purposes should be considered. The existence of a Speedway Team in Newport contributes to increasing the profile of the City both nationally and across Europe. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** There are buses serving the existing employment sites.

**Council Response:**
- Adjacent to site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>232.C3</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for employment use at Queensway Meadows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: Railway Station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: Newport Station. A new station may be constructed at Llanwern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: newport station 5km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: Convenience Shop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: newport retail parks 1.6km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: There are existing employment opportunities in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: Walking and Cycling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: Walking and cycling facilities could be integrated into the proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: Public Rights of Way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: Open Space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: Spytty Park is 1.8km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: Schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: Yes. There are existing schools within the urban area of Newport. It is not considered that this proposal would have an impact on existing education facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: Community Engagement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: Yes. The allocation of the site for employment purposes has been the subject of public scrutiny as part of the UDP process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for employment use at Queensway Meadows.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:** By involvement in the masterplanning process.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:** All services are available in close proximity to the site although some upgrading may be required.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** Some upgrading of infrastructure may be required.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water Supply**

It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. Any upgrade of this asset will likely be considerably expensive. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site useage.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The proposal would not be immediately adjoining existing residential properties.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** The proposal would form a natural extension of the east of Newport towards the Llanwern site.

**Council Response:** Allocated for employment use within the Eastern Expansion Area in the adopted UDP as far south as the protected line of the proposed new M4 motorway.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Precedent Setting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Site Owned by Proposer? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Site Owner? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Interest in Adjoining Land? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Restrictive Covenants? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Realistic Timescale? Yes. Subject to masterplanning and market demand, a start could be expected on site within the early part of the plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Development Boundary Change? No. The site forms part of the area identified on the proposals map of the adopted UDP as being part of the Eastern Expansion area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Unimplemented Planning Permissions? No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

CONSTRUCTION OF 3527M.SQ INDUSTRIAL UNIT, PARKING, ACCESS ROAD AND ASSOCIATED SITE WORKS
01/1428 24/04/2002 Granted with conditions

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: The application site is located close to the SSSI, and any development which has an adverse effect on water quality and quantity will adversely affect the special features of the area. Concerns exist with regard to possible changes to the quality and quantity of water entering the drainage system of the SSSI. Need to be assured that this will be controlled during construction and operation of the development, with the need for monitoring and a contingency plan. Development may have an impact on such species as otters, great crested newts, water voles, bats and badgers which are all present in the general area. There is, therefore, the need for a survey of the site and if any species are found separate licences will need to be issued to allow the development to proceed.

The Local Biodiversity Action Plan has identified a number of priority habitats and species to be the subject of action plans. This includes coastal and flood plan grazing marsh such as the Levels, and consideration has to be given to the impact of the scheme. The Gwent Levels are also included in the Register of Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest.

GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: An archaeological evaluation has been undertaken on site which indicates that no archaeological features of national importance were located on site. No objections to the proposal subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the submission of a detailed programme of investigation prior to the commencement of development. This it is envisaged would be in the form of a watching brief.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C3</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALDICOT AND WENTLOOG LEVELS DRAINAGE BOARD: No objections in principle subject to general compliance with Drainage Byelaws, the retention of maintenance strips adjacent to reens, details of the surface water drainage system being agreed; precautions being taken to avoid pollution and impact on Nature Conservation interests. This area is a natural flood plan and although continued efforts will be made to protect the area no guarantee can be given against the worst effect of weather or tidal conditions. Approximate ground level is 6m AOD, whereas the highest recorded tide is 8.4m AOD. Full details of surface water drainage must be submitted for approval and this should not exceed greenfield flow. Concerns are expressed regarding aspects of the scheme. The existing reen system should be suitably cleansed along its whole length.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR B1 - LIGHT INDUSTRIAL  B2 - GENERAL INDUSTRIAL  AND B8 - WAREHOUSING PURPOSES.

96/0437  13/06/2000 Withdrawn Basement

ROADWAY  FOOTPATH AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES TO SERVE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

90/0907  07/12/1990 Granted with conditions Basement

ERECTION OF 100 000 SQ FT DISTRIBUTION WAREHOUSE AND ATTACHED OFFICE BLOCK  ASSOCIATED LORRY AND CAR PARKING BAYS AND CONSTRUCTION OF ESTATE ROAD.

89/0378  11/08/1989 Granted with conditions Basement

CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW HIGHWAY AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES TO SERVE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

91/0271  10/05/1991 Granted with conditions Basement

06/0471 - REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO CREATE A MIXED USE URBAN EXTENSION COMPRISES: A RANGE OF NEW HOMES (APARTMENTS, HOUSES AND SOME SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION FOR THE ELDERLY - USE CLASSES C2&C3); NEW OFFICES, WORKSHOPS, FACTORIES AND WAREHOUSES (USE CLASSES B1, B2&B8); COMMUNITY FACILITIES INCLUDING NEW SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY CENTRES (USE CLASSES D1&D2); A LOCAL CENTRE INCORPORATING SHOPS, OFFICES AND COMMERCIAL LEISURE FACILITIES INCLUDING NEW BARS, CAFES AND LICENSED PREMISES (USE CLASSES A1, A2, A3&D2); A NETWORK OF OPEN SPACES INCLUDING PARKLAND, FOOTPATHS, SPORTS PITCHES AND AREAS FOR INFORMAL RECREATION; NEW ROADS, ACCESSES AND PATHS; HEALTHCARE AND FITNESS FACILITIES (USE CLASSES D1&D2); PROVISION FOR A NEW RAILWAY HALT/STATION; OTHER ANCILLARY USES AND ACTIVITIES; AND REQUIRING: SITE CLEARANCE, TREATMENT AND PREPARATION; THE INSTALLATION OF NEW SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE; THE CREATION OF NEW WATER BODIES AND DRAINAGE CHANNELS; IMPROVEMENTS/WORKS TO THE HIGHWAYS NETWORK AND OTHER ANCILLARY WORKS AND ACTIVITIES.

Awaiting S106. 23/05/2007

91/0981 - SITE DEVELOPMENT WORK IN THE FORM OF A NEW HIGHWAY AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES TO SERVE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Granted – 04/10/1991

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 8 Other Information?

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C3</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for employment use at Queensway Meadows.

**Question: 9** Map Included?

Representation Text: Yes.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C4</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Employment use of former Pirelli site

**Site: 46/ Pirelli**

**New Site**

**Question: SA Recommendation**

Council Response: It is recommended that the mix of uses on site include some convenience retail as well as services and facilities to serve the new and existing population subject to needs assessment.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

Council Response: The site has planning permissions for employment and housing and is proposed for allocation as such.

**Question: 2.1** Site Name

Representation Text: Pirelli

**Question: 2.2** Location

Representation Text: Telford Street

**Question: 2.3** Grid Reference

Representation Text: ST 326 878

Council Response: 332647 187826

**Question: 2.4** Site Area

Representation Text: 10.4 ha

**Question: 2.5** Brief Description

Representation Text: Large brownfield site, formerly occupied by Pirelli Cables factory.

**Question: 2.6** Current Use

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C4</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td>W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Employment use of former Pirelli site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

- **Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
  - Residential and employment.

- **Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
  - Yes. Former Pirelli Cables Factory.

- **Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
  - No.

- **Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
  - No.

- **Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
  - The site is within a densely populated urban environment characterised by two storey terraced housing. The development would be well screened from the wider area by the existing houses.

  **Council Response:**
  - Countryside Comments: No broad countryside issues. Site specifics would have to be considered, trees visual impact ecology etc.

- **Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
  - No.

  **Council Response:**
  - Trees adjacent to the railway, offers screening

- **Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
  - The development of the site could result in the introduction of green spaces within the development site.

- **Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
  - Yes. The development of the site would result in the introduction of green space within the development site.

- **Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
  - No.

  **Council Response:**
  - Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Ordnance factory (demolished)
  - Minimal Restraint. Conditions may be placed on planning consent. No reason for not allocating in LDP

- **Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
  - 16/02/2012
### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Contamination has been assessed and appropriate remediation has and will be undertaken.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. The site has previously been assessed as being in Zone C1, however since the FCA additional flood defence works have been undertaken, notably adjacent to the Rodney Parade site.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
- **Representation Text:** No. There is a species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. A detailed TIA has been undertaken and can be provided to the Council on request. This site is the subject of an existing outline planning application. Traffic generally ok. Points of access to be determined preferred access Telford street only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** By providing pedestrian access from the site through to Corporation Road.

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Lliswerry Ward that has a shortfall in Informal Play of 2.24Ha and Equipped Play of 2.94Ha. Owing to the size of the development the onsite provision of a LEAP is required to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development with additional off-site contribution for the improvements to informal space.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** By providing pedestrian access from the site through to Corporation Road.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** Adjacent to the site along Corporation Road.

**Council Response:** corporation road south 100m
corporation road north 170m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** 3 Buses per hour in each direction.

**Council Response:** good

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:** Approximately 1.5km to Newport Station.

**Council Response:** newport station 2.7km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:** On Corporation Road.

**Council Response:** corporation road 250m
cromwell road 300m

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:** There are new employment units adjacent to the site and proposed as part of this submission. The site is also in close proximity to the city centre.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:** By allowing pedestrian permeability from within the site to Corporation Road and to the north under the railway.

**Council Response:** on site infrastructure and facilities links onto cycle route (soho street)

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
### Question: 4.9 Open Space?

**Representation Text:**
There are existing playing fields to the south of Corporation Road.

**Council Response:**
200m to Corporation Road Playing Fields.

### Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. There is a primary school and high school in Liswerry, both located on Nash Road.

**Council Response:**
1.4km to Lliswerry PS.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The local community would have been notified of the undetermined residential planning application.

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:**
Consideration could be given to preferred points of access and provision of public open space.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:**
Some services are available from within the site, while others are located in close proximity.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:**
Studies are currently being undertaken.

**Council Response:**
Welsh Water Comments

#### Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water Supply**

It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. Any upgrade of this asset will likely be considerably expensive. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Some employment uses are proposed, however it would be small scale and would reflect the units that have recently been constructed to the north east of the site. It is considered that they would sit comfortably adjacent to the proposed residential development without any adverse impact on amenity.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

*Representation Text:* The site is surrounded on three sides by existing residential and employment land, and by the railway to the north.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

*Representation Text:* The development of the site would not add to the pressures, or provide opportunities for other nearby sites to be developed.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. A start could be expected within 1-3 years. If the planning application is determined favourably, it is anticipated that development could commence imminently.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

*Representation Text:* No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Employment use of former Pirelli site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**

**ERECTION OF 83 – 2, 3 AND 4 BEDROOM HOUSES**
91/0135 27/01/1994 WITHDRAWN
No computer record

**ERECTION OF 114 DWELLINGS – Council development**
91/1200 14/01/1992 DEEMED PERMISSION
No computer record

**PROPOSED RE-LOCATION OF NEWPORT BUS DEPOT AND DEVELOPMENT OF B1 EMPLOYMENT UNITS**
03/1341 10/07/2008 WITHDRAWN
No computer records of Consultees’ response as application withdrawn before Officer’s Report was prepared.

**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE)**
03/1342 NO DECISION
No computer records of Consultees’ response as application withdrawn before Officer’s Report was prepared.

**REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE 45NO. INDUSTRIAL UNITS FOR CLASS B1, B2 AND B8 USE**
05/1042 11/01/2006 GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS
Head of Public Protection and Environmental Services (Environmental Health) – No objection subject to site investigations
Environment Agency - Recommend refusal on the grounds that the consequences of flooding cannot be managed down to an acceptable level, in accordance with the requirements of TAN 15.
Countryside Council For Wales - No objection.
Gwent Police - No objections
Wales And West Utilities - No objection.
Western Power Distribution - Identify apparatus in the area.
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust - No objection

**PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITION 09 (SITE INVESTIGATION) OF PLANNING PERMISSION 05/1042 FOR THE ERECTION OF 45NO. INDUSTRIAL UNITS**
06/0610 17/08/2006 APPROVED
Head of Public Protection and Environmental Services (Pollution) - No objection to partial discharge
Environment Agency - No comment.

**PROPOSED NEW BUS DEPOT CONSISTING OF OFFICES, WORKSHOPS, BUS FUELING & WASHING, APRONS, ROADWAYS, BUS & CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING**
06/1587 11/07/2007 WITHDRAWN

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Employment use of former Pirelli site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
Representation Text: Yes. Undetermined application for residential development.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
Representation Text: Yes.
Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response: C2 in part of site: it is recommended that this part of the site is not developed and that green infrastructure is provided within the site to include SUDS.

☐ SINC designated areas; close to SSSI: buffer areas should be created to avoid potential harm to these sites.

☐ Primary facilities community hall and open space (inc. „various community facilities” unspecified) to be provided as part of development- suggest some employment is also provided as part of the development (this could be in the form of live/work units).

☐ Scheduled Ancient Monument; borders ASA: buffer areas free from development should be created if appropriate to retain the integrity and value of archaeological assets.

☐ May harm potential of tourism assets including historic and environmental features: it should be ensured that the potential of the area of tourism development is investigated and realised onsite.

Similar allocation site to site 23 (250.C1).

☐ SINC designation- any potentially negative effects on habitats or species should be investigated and mitigated prior to development on site.

☐ Part C2 designation: it is recommended that development does not occur within the flood plain, and that SUDS are implemented throughout the site to ensure that there is no increase in net surface water runoff. Avoiding the flood plain will also help to ensure that water quality is maintained.

☐ The areas classified as high quality agricultural land should not be developed if possible. Further, the retention of the woodland is recommended.

☐ It is recommended that the sites provides a mix of uses to include a full range of community facilities such as those included within Table 3.4 to reduce the need to travel and reduce potential inequalities.

☐ There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument within the site - a Bronze Age round barrow (Mm 170) - near Underwood; and another - a motte (Mn59) - close to the site at Langstone Court Farm. ASA borders the southern limits of Llanwern Park. It should be ensured that the development of the site does not negatively affect the setting or integrity of archaeological features. Where possible these should be enhanced. The mix of uses could include tourist facilities to maximise the tourism potential of the area.

☐ Public transport improvements should be required as part of development on the site.

Council Response:

Overall Council Response: Currently consented site at Llanwern Village provides a good supply of greenfield land, better located in terms of infrastructure.

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Eastern Expansion Area

Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: Land between Llanwern, Langstone and Underwood.

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Representation Text: ST 377 891

Council Response: 337559 188737
## Summary: Candidate site proposal for residential Llanwern - Underwood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description
- The site comprises a substantial tract of land, which extends from Llanwern Park in the south to the M4 motorway in the north, and from Llanwern village in the west to Underwood in the east. In the main it comprises agricultural land with blocks of woodland, the largest of which is Great Wood on the south-eastern edge of the site. Topography varies from <10m AOD in the south of the site to >40m AOD near the motorway. The site lies either side of and drains to Monk’s Ditch, a watercourse that arises near Llanmartin, to the north of the motorway, and flows south-westwards and under the main railway line.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use
- Agriculture and woodland.

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
- Residential-led mixed use development. A master plan will be developed to determine the precise mix of uses.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
- No.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
- No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
- Yes. The majority of the site comprises land in Grades 3B and 4 or non-agricultural land (woodland). There are limited areas of Grade 2 and 3A agricultural land in the northern part of the site.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
- The site contains a limited number of landscape character areas. From the development standpoint, the most sensitive of these is the higher land in the northern part of the site. This and other aspects of the character of the site would be taken into account in drawing up a master plan for future development.

---

Welsh Government comment: There is a moderate probability of BMV at this large site. A pre-revision survey (035-85) found a mosaic of non-agricultural, urban, Grade 2, 3a, 3b, 3c and 4 with the small area (approx 6 ha) of Grade 2 being found towards the North of the site and the area of 3a being found along the North Eastern boundary. Soils are largely poor being Worcester and Denchworth but climate is favourable (203 FCD’s) and the site is flat throughout.

Moderate Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.

Council Response:

- Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of Moderate to High value in LANDMAP. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues...
| Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows? | Representation Text: Yes. The site contains a number of woodlands, mature trees and hedgerows, some of which may qualify as “important” under the Hedgerow Regulations. A tree and hedgerow appraisal would be carried out prior to preparing the master plan. |
| Council Response: Group TPO Ref 14/Mon - Broad leaved woodland consisting mainly of Ash and Oak. 04/2000 - Mixed woodland comprised of oak, ash, holly, hawthorn, sycamore, hazel, field maple, popular and with some areas of willow birch lime and beech. Ancient Woodland and TPO 4/2000 Routs Wood and Great Wood TPO 14 Mon Stockwood and other trees with TPO potential. |

| Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features? | Representation Text: Comprehensive master planning of the site would be responsive to ecological and landscape (as well as other) interests, resulting in the retention of important biodiversity or landscape features within the site and enhancement. |

| Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement? | Representation Text: Yes. Comprehensive master planning would provide an opportunity for the creation of green spaces and corridors within the site. |

| Question: 3.16 Archaeology? | Representation Text: Yes. There is a scheduled ancient monument within the site - a Bronze Age round barrow (Mm 170) - near Underwood; and another - a motte (Mn59) - close to the site at Langstone Court Farm. |
| Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Majority of area inside Llanwern Park, registered historic park. Possible Roman military site also located in area. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Park would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP. |

| Question: 3.2 Greenfield? | Representation Text: Yes. |

| Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk? | Representation Text: No. |

| Question: 3.4 Flood Risk? | Representation Text: Yes. The majority of the site is in Zone A on the TAN 15 development advice map and, therefore, considered to be at little or no risk of flooding. A small part of the site, around Monk's Ditch, falls in Zone B or Zone C2 and, as such would not be developed. |
| Council Response: Monk's Ditch is classified as Zone C2. |

| Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course? | Representation Text: Yes. The Monk’s Ditch and a few minor tributaries of it lie within the site. |

| Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems? |
### Question: 3.7  SSSI?

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site does not contain a SSSI or any other statutorily designates area of nature conservation interest.

**Council Response:**
- Part of the site lies within a registered historic park, which is a non-statutory designation. The park would be retained as part of the master plan.
- **cSins - Stock Wood (east and West), Craig-Y-Perthi Field North, The Routes Wood, Monk's Ditch.**
- Land to the north of the M4 includes Langstone and Llanmartin Meadows SSSI.
- Llanwern Park is listed as Grade II in the Register of Parks and Gardens in Wales held by CADW.
- Number of Environmental Spaces within site.

### Question: 3.8  Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Surveys undertaken in 2003 identified the presence, or possible presence, of protected species including badgers and bats. This would not preclude development and the site is large enough to permit any necessary ecological mitigation to take place within its boundaries. Development of the site in accordance with a comprehensive master plan is likely to allow for ecological enhancement.

**Council Response:**
- There are species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

### Question: 3.9  Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:** No. There are no conservation areas or listed buildings within the site boundary. The nearest listed building is Langstone Court Farmhouse (Grade II).

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments within historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

### Question: 4.1  Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site be accessed from the A455 and would be linked with other development to the north of the railway line.

**Council Response:**
- The impact of traffic generated by the development would be the subject of a transport assessment. A travel plan would be developed to encourage movement by modes other than the private car.
- Partially, 2 sites north of M4 do not abir a highway.
- No. access via lanes not acceptable.
- Part. Several parcels are isolated.
- Unknown. Transport assessment required. Rural lanes unsuitable for any development traffic.

### Question: 4.10  Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:** Development of the area could contribute towards a network of pedestrian and cycle routes in East Newport.
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site proposal for residential Llanwern - Underwood.

---

**Council Response:**

The proposed development falls within the Llanwern/Langstone Wards that have a combined play shortfall of 6.09Ha. A site of this size would generate a substantial amount of houses and increased population. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population. The master plan would need to meet the requirements of TAN16 for the provision of Sport, Recreation and Open Space.

---

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

- Public transport provision, access to it and support for it would be an integral part of the master planning process.

---

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**

- The area is poorly served by public transport at present. The proposed development would enable a better service to be provided and development on the site would support public transport services in the area.

**Council Response:**

chepstow rd, Magor rd and underwood various distances, most outside of maximum walk.

Various bus route on chepstow road, Magor road & underwood.

---

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**

- There is a limited service at present.

**Council Response:**

20-30 minute service

---

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**

- Newport is the nearest railway station. The South East Wales Transport Alliance Rail Strategy (January 2006) proposes a new station at Llanwern in 2012-13.

**Council Response:**

newport station

5 miles

---

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**

- Appropriate retail provision would form part of the comprehensive mixed use development of the site.

**Council Response:**

garage shop chepstow rd langstone and underwood shopping centre various distances.

Various underwood shopping, garage shop, chepstow

---

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**

- The site is well located in relation to a range of employment opportunities in Newport and elsewhere. Employment land provision would form part of the development proposals.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**

- Comprehensive masterplanning would ensure that walking and cycling are encouraged within the development, with appropriate links to the extensive public rights of way networks in
### Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site proposal for residential Llanwern - Underwood.

---

#### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Two public rights if way cross parts of the site. It is expected that these would be retained on their existing alignments and would not need to be stopped-up.

**Council Response:** Ref 394/6, 394/1, 394/2, 397/1, 394/7 and 394/3. 394/16 18 21 22 24 35 75, AND ALSO 397/12 11, 13, 14, 15

#### Question: 4.9 Open Space?

**Representation Text:** Open space provision would be an integral part of the master planning process in accordance with TAN 19.

**Council Response:** Underwood playing field and playground.

#### Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:** Secondary education is available at Hartridge Comprehensive School. Primary school provision would be facilitated as part of the development.

**Council Response:** Yes. Secondary education is available at Hartridge Comprehensive School. Primary school provision would be facilitated as part of the development.

#### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:** The Eastern Expansion Area is the subject of a UDP policy and approved Supplementary Planning Guidance, both of which were the subject of public consultation.

**Council Response:** Yes. The Eastern Expansion Area is the subject of a UDP policy and approved Supplementary Planning Guidance, both of which were the subject of public consultation.

#### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:** By ensuring community engagement through all stages of the master planning and development process.

**Council Response:** By ensuring community engagement through all stages of the master planning and development process.

#### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:** Additional facilities would be created as part of the development.

**Council Response:** No.

#### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:** There is limited capacity available within the existing networks and further provision will be necessary to serve the development.

**Council Response:** No.

#### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:** Construction impacts would arise during development but would be mitigated by the effective use of a construction travel and management plan.

**Council Response:** Yes. Construction impacts would arise during development but would be mitigated by the effective use of a construction travel and management plan.

#### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:** There is limited capacity available within the existing networks and further provision will be necessary to serve the development.

**Council Response:** No.

---

16/02/2012
Sewerage

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelwork’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.
### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representations Text:**
Yes. Employment uses would form part of the proposals. Their location would be determined as part of the master planning process, but they are likely to be confined to Class B1 uses which are acceptable in a residential environment.

### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representations Text:**
The Council's approved SPG advises that the Eastern Expansion Area is a major part of the growth strategy for the city of Newport which is set out in the adopted UDP. The development of the candidate site would assist in that process and would create links with existing settlements such as Underwood.

**Council Response:**
The candidate site includes part of the greenfield element of the EEA. The remainder of the site is situated in designated countryside.

### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

**Representations Text:**
This site would form part of a comprehensive expansion of Newport as foreshadowed in the adopted UDP and approved SPG.

### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representations Text:**
Yes. The freehold of the site is owned jointly by the Welsh Ministers and Persimmon Homes.

### Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

**Representations Text:**
No. Agent for one of the joint freehold owners.

### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

**Representations Text:**
No.

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

**Representations Text:**
No.

### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?

**Representations Text:**
Yes. The size of the site dictates that the development would be carried out in phases. A start on site is feasible within 4 - 6 years and the development of the site could be completed by the end of the plan period.

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

**Representations Text:**
No. The whole of the site is identified on the UDP proposals map as lying within the Eastern Expansion Area.

**Council Response:**
EEA and settlement boundary would need to be extended to include land currently allocated as countryside.

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representations Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
ERECTION OF ONE DETACHED DWELLING
Relevant planning history on adjacent site:
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE) – 05/0406 – Granted

ERECTION OF 6 NO. TWO BEDROOM APARTMENTS – 07/0135 – granted

ERECTION OF 8NO. RESIDENTIAL UNITS (AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMISSION 07/0135 FOR THE ERECTION OF 6NO. 2 BED APARTMENTS) 08/1386 - Granted

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text:
- The Welsh Ministers and Persimmon Homes are the joint freehold owners of a substantial block of land lying between the settlements of Llanwern, Underwood and Langstone on the eastern side of Newport: see attached plan. For the most part, the land lies south of the M4 motorway and within the area subject to Policy SP26 – Eastern Expansion Area (EEA) of the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011; only a small proportion of the land holding lies to the north of the motorway.

In adopting the UDP, the Council took the strategic decision to develop Newport in an easterly direction and embedded that proposal for a sustainable urban extension as an integral element of the future regeneration of the city. Indeed, the EEA is described in the UDP (para 5.10) as “...a key part of the vision of the Newport Regeneration Programme”. The selection of the EEA followed consideration of various options for the accommodation of major growth around the city. The rationale for that selection is as valid today as when the UDP was being prepared.

Although the UDP limited development within the EEA to 1700 dwellings, and other uses, in what remained of the plan period (to 2011), the strategic decision clearly contemplated substantial development after that date. This was essential to ensure the provision of new infrastructure and the full range of facilities that the Council expected to serve development in this location. Paragraph 5.14 of the UDP recognized that the range and choice of sites within the EEA were such as to provide for significant growth beyond the plan period; and this was also acknowledged in supplementary planning guidance – the East Newport Development Framework Plan (see paras 2.4 and 2.5, for example). The SPG (para 4.4) foresaw development of up to 2500 new dwellings in the northern part of the EEA, compared with the UDP allocation of 1100 for that area.

The candidate site offers the major opportunity to continue the development strategy set out in the adopted UDP for the LDP plan period, which runs until 2026. The elements of this strategy are designed to:
- complement the redevelopment of brownfield sites within the city;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessNNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site proposal for residential Llanwern - Underwood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- support regeneration in the inner urban area and in other communities such as Underwood;
- provide for range and choice of living environments in an attractive setting;
- contribute to the costs of providing new infrastructure;
- support the initial provision and subsequent retention of good public transport, schools and other community services.

**Question: 9**
Map Included? Yes.
### Question: SA Recommendation
Council Response: SINC designation: likely that habitats and species will be negatively affected. Mitigation should be ensured before any development is undertaken on site to ensure that the reasons for the SINC designation are maintained. This could be possible given the proposed land use on site, however, it is recommended that no residential development is allowed, and access to visitor facilities is limited to public transport, walking and cycling.

### Question: Overall Council Response
Council Response: The candidate site is covered in parts by a number of environmental designations, including a SINC and ancient semi natural woodland and adjoins a Local Nature Reserve. Allocation of this greenfield site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

Furthermore, additional housing land is not required to meet the LDP’s housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

With regards to the visitor and tourism facilities, development in the countryside is considered inappropriate unless it can be demonstrated that a rural location is essential. Visitor accommodation is more appropriately located within the settlement boundary, close to other facilities and transport links.

It is recommended that the candidate site is not allocated for housing or visitor/tourism accommodation in the Local Development Plan.

### Question: Site Name
Representation Text: Land at Allt-yr-yn

### Question: Location
Representation Text: Land between M4 Motorway and the Ridgeway.

### Question: Grid Reference
Representation Text: 291000 88500
Council Response: 328955 188274

### Question: Site Area
Representation Text: 47ha (24ha developable).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Lat?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>299.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed tourism, visitor accommodation and low density housing on land at Allt-yr-yn

**Council Response:** 29.46ha

**Question: 2.5** Brief Description

**Question: 2.6** Current Use
- Mainly vacant, apart grazing, part silage, part commercial equestrian.

**Question: 2.7** Proposed Use(s)
- Tourism, visitor accommodation - lob cabins/hotel, extremely low density housing.

**Question: 3.1** Brownfield?
- No. Part equestrian.

**Question: 3.10** Minerals Safeguarding Area?
- No.

**Question: 3.11** Agricultural Land?
- Yes. Part grade 3/4 silage.

**Question: 3.12** Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
- Local landscape is steep to gently undulating. The development would only occur on gently undulating land and would be fully screened by existing trees and woodland. Development would not be visible from the boundaries.

**Council Response:**
- Countryside comments: Unacceptable for any development in an area as designated as Local Nature Reserve and SINC. Impact on visual and Landscape Amenity of Open Countryside.

**Question: 3.13** Trees and Hedgerows?
- Yes. There are mature trees. They are not protected. They will be retained and protected as part of any development.

**Council Response:**
- Individual TPO Ref 1/73 - Ash, Oak, and Silver Birch
  - Group Ref: 1/73 - An area of trees comprising mainly ash, birch, oak, gean, hawthorn and hazel and Nu, berd A1 on the Map.
  - Ref 3/88 - Wood consisting of Ash Birch Alder and Beech.
  - Ancient woodland area as shown on Forestry Commission records.
  - Council owned TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14** Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
- All major features will be retained and biodiversity will be encouraged.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Archaeology? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Cwrt-y-Mwynws is a post-medieval farm and may have a medieval precursor. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Greenfield? Yes. Part Equestrian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Contaminated Land Risk? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Flood Risk? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Adjacent to Water Course? Yes. Monmouthshire &amp; Brecon Canal. The source of part tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Topography / Stability Problems? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>SSSI? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cSinc and Local Nature Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Protected Species? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>299.C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/2009 P P W M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed tourism, visitor accommodation and low density housing on land at Allt-yr-yn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Access to Highway?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes access via brickyard lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not acceptable . Dangerous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allt-yr-yn view not suitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access via 749 ridgeway requires a visibility splay of 45 -43 metres. Transport assesment required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated paths would provide access to open space provided for the public and tourism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed development falls within the Allt-Yr-Yn Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 7.61Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor, tourists, guests and occupants will be able to walk with ease to existing bus stops and to the train station within 15 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Bus Route?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 5 minutes walk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350 metres to edge of site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Bus Frequency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bus routes. 1/2 hour service between routes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 min - 1hour service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Railway Station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 1/2 miles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>newport station 1.4km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16/02/2012
### Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** Several clusters. 1/2 to 1m. One to three units in each cluster.
- **Council Response:** 750 metres
  - Ridgeway Avenue 2 general stores.

### Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** City centre and City Hall within walking distance.

### Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** Dedicated paths and cycle tracks will be constructed.
- **Council Response:** National Cycle Route runs through the western edge of the site.
  - On site provisions linking onto canal tow path

### Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** PROW 384/1 and 384/2 384/21

### Open Space?
- **Representation Text:** The site borders open space and incorporates it.
- **Council Response:** Ridgeway.

### Schools?
- **Representation Text:**
  - Yes. High Cross Primary School
  - Rogerstone Primary School
  - Cefn Wood Community Centre
  - Glasslwch Primary School
  - University of Wales (Allt-yr-yn Campus)
  - St Mary R.C. Primary School
  - Queens Hill

### Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Community Aspirations?
- **Representation Text:** The dedicated paths and routes would open up the area to residents and the tourism centres proposed can be used by residents. All existing services can be upgraded at the developers cost.
### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

- **Representation Text:** Water, sewerage, electricity, gas, telecommunications are located in or near the site boundaries and within Ridgeway. All can be connected to without major disturbance to neighbouring property.
- **Council Response:**

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** Comments by Welsh Water

#### Sewage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

#### Water Supply

It is unlikely that our Kingsway and Melbourne pumping stations can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

#### Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

#### Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>299.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed tourism, visitor accommodation and low density housing on land at All-t-yr-yn improvements beign undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjuntion with the developer an the planning deparment via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prioir to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**
*Representation Text: Yes. Employment for tourism/hotels etc they will be located well away from existing and proposed properties and would be sited and screened away from all sightlines.*

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**
*Representation Text: It is on the urban fringe of Newport. It adjoins existing residential development and incorporates exising equestrian use and would encourage tourism from the motorway junction. Council Response: The site adjoins the existing settlement boundary.*

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
*Representation Text: It would not create negative pressures. The road, paths and cycletracks would create access to sites leading Barrack Hill and would enable further tourism sites to benefit the canal.*

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
*Representation Text: Yes. Council owned land adjoins the site and would ideally be incorporated in the design.*

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
*Representation Text: No. Architectural practice with the aim of creating an eco sensitive and nerging development with minimal impact on the surrounding.*

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
*Representation Text: Yes. 1 to 3 years of the start of the LDP. Funding is in place for the development.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>299.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed tourism, visitor accommodation and low density housing on land at Alltyryn

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Would require a change to the settlement boundary and countryside designation.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**
  - ERECTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING WITH INTEGRAL GARAGE
    - 89/0758 08/12/1989 Refused
    - No computer record
  - CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND FOR USE AS MOTORCROSS TRACK
    - 92/0917 27/11/1992 Refused
    - No computer record
  - CHANGE OF USE FROM FAMILY DWELLING TO RESIDENTIAL CHILDRENS HOME
    - 97/0439 11/03/1998 Withdrawn
    - No computer record

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

- **Representation Text:** The land is near to existing riding facilities and the Monmouthshire and Brecon Canal. All are tourist interest.
  
  Visitor accommodation comprising hotel and log cabins (Green and Eco Friendly) are to be constructed for the tourism demand that does exist, thus providing employment for the area.

  There is a demand for low density housing screened in the environment and affordable housing.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

### 300  Beaton Thomas Scarlioli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal for museum and visitor centre, employment and low density housing, country, leisure and recreation park on Land at Penrhos Farm, Caerleon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** Penrhos

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

- Part of site appears to be within Flood Zone C2- it should be ensured that the development of the site does not increase the risk of or from flooding.
- Site contains a listed building: proposals should seek to enhance this asset.
- Close to SAC, SSSI and SINC designations: any potential effects should be investigated and mitigated prior to development on site (see HRA also).
- Any potential contamination of land or effect on watercourses should be minimised.
- The site could seek to provide additional public transport provision to ensure that visitors are able to access the site sustainably and easily.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

- The site is a Greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Caerleon, designated as Countryside. There are a number of environmental designations on the site including the Afon llywd Grasslands, Coed Y Gatlas and Afon Llywd candidate sites of nature importance (cSINCs). The site also has a number of Tree Preservation Orders and a Public Right of Way. The land has also been identified as an area of moderate to high value in the LANDMAP assessment. The site is important in terms of Archaeology and there is a record of a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

  The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.

  Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

  The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8

  This site was also considered as part of the Unitary Development Plan inquiry. In considering whether the site should be included in the Unitary Development Plan for housing development, the Inspector recommended that the site should not be allocated (Ref para. 3.7) and that the site performs badly in terms of the search sequence set out in Planning Policy Wales (Ref para. 3.93 of the Inspectors Report)

  It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated as Countryside and that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation

**Question:** Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land at Penrhos Farm, Caerleon.

**Question:** Location

---

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.3</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>34200 - 92000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>334161 334161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.4</td>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>85ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>110.1ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.5</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Undulating and flatland civil war fort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.6</td>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Farmland grade 3/4 scrub, woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.7</td>
<td>Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Museum and visitor centre, employment, low density housing, affordable housing, country, leisure and recreation park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.1</td>
<td>Brownfield?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.10</td>
<td>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.11</td>
<td>Agricultural Land?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Part grass silage grass 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Welsh Government comment: There is a low probability of there being BMV land at this site. Large areas are ruled out due to slope whilst poor soils and high FCD will limit the grades of the remaining areas. This is supported by a pre revision survey (002k78) that covered the majority of the site and found the area to be mostly Grade 4 with some areas of subgrade 3b. Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.12</td>
<td>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The land gently rises to a plateau. Comprises trees a woodland and a derelict quarry. The development would be screened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Countryside comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary
Proposal for museum and visitor centre, employment and low density housing, country, leisure and recreation park on Land at Penrhos Farm, Caerleon.

**NOT suitable for development:** incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Area has Moderate to High LandMAP values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?</strong></td>
<td>No. There are trees and hedgerows that are not protected. They will be retained and protected as part of the development.</td>
<td>TPOs - Ref 84/Mon, 78/Mon - mixed broadleaved woodland consisting of ash, beech, birch, oak, gean. 19/2000 - Wet woodland comprised mainly of Alder with some willow. TPOs 84/Mon and 4/2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</strong></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.16 Archaeology?</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Civil war fort that will become part of the attraction, museum and visitor centre.</td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Penrhos Camp is a Civil War fortification and a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Roman burials are known from southern part of area and in area surrounding Penrhos Camp. Major Restraint. Direct impact on scheduled ancient monument and on its setting. The area should not be allocated in LDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 Greenfield?</strong></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4 Flood Risk?</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Not within Zones C1 or C2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Part of adjacent to the Afon Llwyd. That part will remain undeveloped. The land then rises to a level platform. The development will definitely not be subject to any flooding issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
cSinc k Afon Llwyd Grasslands, Coed Y Gatlas, Afon Llwyd.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
Listed building (2 within)
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Council Response:**
yes existing access sub standard
existing on new junctions
require vis splays of 4.5 x 21.5 metres (may be reduced subject to speed surveys) transport assessment req

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
Dedicated paths and cycleways would provide access to open space.

**Council Response:**
The proposed development falls within the Caerleon Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 3.64Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population. The master plan would need to meets the requirements of TAN16 for the provision of Sport, Recreation and Open Space.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
Visitors, tourists, guests and occupants will be able to walk with ease to existing bus stops and to Caerleon train station if it is reopened as stated in the UDP.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
5 to 10 minute walk dependant upon where you are located in the site.

**Council Response:**
20-150 metres from site bundary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>Accessn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** 1/2 hour service between routes.

**Council Response:** 2 hour service.

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
- Caerleon - 1/2 mile
- Cwmbran 4 3/4 miles
- Newport - 4 1/2 miles

**Council Response:** Newport station 5 miles

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:** Caerleon Town and corner shops - 1/2 to 1 mile.

**Council Response:** 500 metres to station road & central area facilities

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:** Caerleon centre within walking distance.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:** Dedicated paths and cycle tracks will be constructed.

**Council Response:** On site infrastructure & facilities

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:** No. Several footpaths exist as shown on the plan.

**Council Response:**
- 389/2
- 389/3
- 389/ 24, and also 23 25 25A 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 & 33

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:** The site borders open space and will promote and incorporate open space as a greater part of the development.

**Council Response:** Various areas of open space and play grounds in Caerleon.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Caerleon Comprehensive
### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:** The dedicated paths and cycleways would open up the area to residents and the tourism centres proposed can be used by residents. All existing services can be upgraded at the developers' cost.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:** All services are located in the roads forming part of the site boundary. All can be connected to without major disturbance to neighbouring property.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off-site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off-site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off-site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling...
Summary: Proposal for museum and visitor centre, employment and low density housing, country, leisure and recreation park on Land at Penhos Farm, Caerleon.

assessments would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
Representation Text: Yes. Employment for tourism purposes would be located well away from existing and proposed properties and would be sited and screened away from all sight lines.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
Representation Text: Natural progression for mixed clean development from Caerleon and Ponthir Road.
Council Response: Site does not adjoin the current settlement boundary.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
Representation Text: It would not add to pressures. The upgrading of infrastructure would assist future developments and possibly the change of use for the Star Trading Estate and Western Industrial Estate.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
Representation Text: No. In excess of 80% is in the ownership of the proposer. All the proposal can be located on the proposers land if need be.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
Representation Text: No. Architectural practice with the aim of creating an eco sensitive and merging design and development with minimal impact on the surroundings.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Summary: Proposal for museum and visitor centre, employment and low density housing, country, leisure and recreation park on Land at Penrhos Farm, Caerleon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

Representation Text: Yes. 1 to 3 years of the stage of the LDP. Funding is in place for the proposal.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: The settlement boundary and countryside designation would need to be changed.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response:

- ERECTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING
  - 89/0473 06/10/1989 Refused
  - No computer record

- ERECTION OF SIX DWELLINGS AND ACCESS ROAD
  - 91/0538 04/10/1991 Refused
  - No computer record

- ERECTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING
  - 91/1185 15/11/1991 Refused
  - No computer record

- PROPOSED PONY TREKKING CENTRE WITH TEMPORARY DWELLING
  - 92/0119 03/07/1992 Refused
  - No computer record

- RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
  - 06/0017 22/02/2006 Refused

- ERECTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING (OUTLINE)
  - 06/0773 20/07/2006 Refused
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Planning Application Refusals?</th>
<th>Planning Applications Pending?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Information?**

The land is centered around the remains of a civil war fort and is not in a flood plain and is of walking distance to public transport. Existing infrastructure has capacity and can be connected to. It can also be upgraded to accommodate other developments in the area if need be.

A museum and visitor centre dedicated to the civil war and the Roman way of life will encourage tourism and provide employment for the area. There is a requirement for low density housing and affordable housing. This will all give a soft edge to Caerleon from the countryside leading into the existing more densely developed Caerleon town centre. The proposal does not infringe on countryside conservation policies.

**Map Included?**

Representation Text: Yes.
**Rep'n/Para/Policy**  AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302.C1</td>
<td>P W MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential, community facilities and minor retail at Land r/o The Meadows/Mallards Reach, Marshfield.

**Site:** Mallards Reach

**Question: SA Recommendation**

It is recommended that the site does not go forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:

- Flood Zone C1;
- May affect SPA; RAMSAR;
- Part of site is within SSSI; adjacent to SINC;
- Likely to lead to significant increase in traffic dependent on volume of residential provision proposed- recommend development only be permitted if can be proven that public transport can be improved to increased frequency to centres of employment and the railway station;
- Within Archeologically Sensitive Area and Gwent Levels Historic Landscape Characterisation Area Trowbridge: Trowbridge: "a very remote area of landscape)- development likely to significantly affect the character of the area as would be a large increase in existing settlement size (especially cumulatively with Marshfield East allocation); and
- Increased pollution from traffic (air and noise).

**Council Response:**

This site lies within Green Belt land on the western boundary of Marshfield, as adopted under the Newport Unitiary Development Plan. It is also in a C1 protected flood risk area. Local Planning Authorities have a duty to direct development away from such areas.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

This site lies within Green Belt land on the western boundary of Marshfield, as adopted under the Newport Unitiary Development Plan.

It is also in a C1 protected flood risk area. Local Planning Authorities have a duty to direct development away from such areas.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question: Site Name**

**Representation Text:** Land to rear of the Meadows/Mallards reach, Marshfield, Wentlooge.

**Question: Location**

**Representation Text:** Land to rear of the Meadows/Mallards Reach, Marshfield, Wentlooge, Newport.

**Question: Grid Reference**

**Council Response:** 325244 182098

**16/02/2012**
## Question: 2.4 Site Area
- **Representation Text:** Approx. 28.5 ha (70 acres)
- **Council Response:** 26.42ha

## Question: 2.5 Brief Description
- **Representation Text:** Generally open and level land currently used for agricultural purposes.

## Question: 2.6 Current Use
- **Representation Text:** Agricultural land.

## Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
- **Representation Text:** Mixed use: residential, community facilities, minor retail.

## Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
- **Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
- **Representation Text:** No.

## Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Land classification not known.

## Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
- **Representation Text:** Predominately level landscape, site located behind and adjoining existing residential development to the east and industrial to the south west, therefore minimal isolated long-range views.

## Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Hedgerows on external field boundaries although can be retained within any development proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential, community facilities and minor retail at Land r/o The Meadows/Mallards Reach, Marshfield.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

**Question:** 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**

- Provision of green corridors, accessible wildlife areas, green spaces and community recreation facilities.

**Question:** 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Provide access to countryside area, walks and recreation facilities.

**Question:** 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Council Response:**

- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Majority of area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Also on edge between solid geology and alluvium of the Levels. This area is a likely location of settlements of all periods. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP

**Question:** 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes.

**Question:** 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question:** 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Partially within former flood zone from sea/river although in an area where existing sea defences have been constructed and is subject to existing flood defences.

- Majority of site is within C1.

**Question:** 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Ditches and reens in locality of site.

**Question:** 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question:** 3.7 SSSI?

**Representation Text:**

- Not known

- SSSI - Gwent Levels - Rumney and Peterstone SSSI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** Agricultural land so unlikely.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:**

- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a

**Within Newport boundary**

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Via existing adjoining residential development, retained accesses from the main highway and/or over other land within the applicants control.

**Council Response:**

- The site is considered to be accessible to the public highway. The shires. St mellons rd.
- Shires- minor residential rd access, appears achievable by extending the Shires into the site.
- Good visibility onto marshfield rd.
- St mellons rd. poor visibility 2.4x 215m. Lack of footways. Poor junction onto marshfield rd.
- Transport Assessment Required

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

- Provide pathways, links, open spaces, green corridors, accessible wildlife areas, green spaces and community recreation facilities.

**Council Response:**

- The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

- Provide direct footpath links to public transport routes.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**

- Less than 50 metres

**Council Response:**

- Marshfield rd.
- St mellons rd.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential, community facilities and minor retail at Land r/o The Meadows/Mallards Reach, Marshfield.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
- Approximately one per hour.

**Council Response:**
- 1-2 hr frequency

**Question: 4.4** Railway Station?
- Representation Text: Approximately 4 miles.
- Council Response: Newport 6.5 miles

**Question: 4.5** Convenience Shop?
- Representation Text: Less than 50 metres, one shop, however this proposal would allow the creation of additional local shopping facilities.
- Council Response: Marshfield rd. p.o + shop 700m site boundary development could enhance local facilities.

**Question: 4.6** Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- Representation Text: Less than 0.25 miles from employment at St.Mellons, less than 1 mile from A48 and access to Cardiff and Newport centres.

**Question: 4.7** Walking and Cycling?
- Representation Text: Provision of path networks to link with national cycle network.
- Council Response: Links into existing no footways on st mellons rd. No cycleways.

**Question: 4.8** Public Rights of Way?
- Representation Text: No. PROW FPs 399/12 & 399/45
- Council Response: 399/4 & 399/1

**Question: 4.9** Open Space?
- Representation Text: In village centre approx. 100 metres although provision can be made on site for enhanced open space provision.

**Question: 5.1** Schools?
- Representation Text: Yes. Marshfield Primary School, 4 other primary schools within 4 miles. 5 secondary schools within 3 miles.

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Po</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302.C1</td>
<td>P P WP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed residential, community facilities and minor retail at Land r/o The Meadows/Mallards Reach, Marshfield.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

Response: No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

Response: Provision of enhanced community facilities and buildings, open areas and a range of residential and commercial opportunities.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Response: Additional community facilities can be provided within the proposals.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

Response: Within 50 metres.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

Response: No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Response: Yes.

**Welsh Water Comments**

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed residential, community facilities and minor retail at Land r/o The Meadows/Mallards Reach, Marshfield.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

*Representative Text:* Yes. Can be designed within the site. Small-scale employment/commercial/shopping facilities can be included as community scale facilities.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

*Representative Text:* Immediately adjoining existing pattern of development.

*Council Response:* Adjoins Marshfield Village Boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

*Representative Text:* To be able to provide a comprehensive development masterplan for the whole site including mixed use, community facilities without pressure on existing facilities. Opportunity for large-scale investment in mixed use development.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

*Representative Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

*Representative Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

*Representative Text:* Yes. See blue area.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

*Representative Text:* No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

*Representative Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

*Representative Text:* Yes. Changes to position of existing development boundary.

*Council Response:* Amend existing village development boundary.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Council Response:**

- **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (5 DWELLINGS)**
  - 90/0198 09/03/1990 Refused
    - No computer record
  - ERECTION OF 28 HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED ROADS AND DRAINAGE FACILITIES
    - 90/1213 05/04/1991 Granted with conditions
    - No computer record
  - ERECTION OF ONE DETACHED HOUSE
    - 93/0044 26/02/1993 Refused
    - No computer record
  - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING FORTY-FIVE TWO STOREY DWELLINGS
    - 93/0381 02/07/1993 Granted with conditions
    - No computer record
  - RESIDENTIAL DWELLING DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING FORTY FIVE TWO STOREY DWELLINGS
    - 93/0382 02/07/1993 Withdrawn
    - No computer record
  - ERECTION OF 21 NO. TWO STOREY DWELLINGS AND GARAGES (SUBSTITUTION OF HOUSE TYPES AND REVISION OF LAYOUT AS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED)
    - 94/0640 09/09/1994 Granted with conditions
    - No computer record
  - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
    - 96/0061 06/01/1997 Refused
    - No computer record
  - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
    - 97/1254 25/03/1998 Refused
    - No computer record

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

- **Representation Text:**
  - No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

- **Representation Text:**
  - No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

- Opportunity to provide a mixed use site to enable a mix of residential types, low cost housing, community enhancement, minor retail outlets, through mixed use, mixed tenure and housing ownership options. Opportunity to provide housing association housing within a comprehensive development strategy in close proximity to existing employment centres and main public transport routes/arterial roads.

- Provision of community facilities in conjunction with residential site to include community buildings, play/park facilities, school/medical facilities and minor retail outlets to enhance and provide local facilities to compliment other local sustainability objectives.

- Opportunity to upgrade/enhance existing village infrastructure with upgrading of local sewerage facilities through new development.

**Question: 9**

**Map Included?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for leisure/recreation and residential on Broadway Farm, Caerleon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** Broadway Farm

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

### Question: 2.1 Site Name
**Representation Text:** Broadway Farm, Caerleon.

### Question: 2.2 Location
**Representation Text:** Broadway Farm, Broadway, Caerleon.

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
**Representation Text:** 3336 - 1902
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303.C1</td>
<td>333847-190240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for leisure/recreation and residential on Broadway Farm, Caerleon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.4</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>3.73ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.5</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Open fields and farm buildings extending from Broadway to River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.6</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.7</th>
<th>Proposed Use(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Leisure/recreation and residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.1</th>
<th>Brownfield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.10</th>
<th>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.11</th>
<th>Agricultural Land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Classification not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Welsh Government comment: There is a low probability of BMV at this site. The proximity to the river and low elevation mean the site is likely to suffer periodic flooding. In addition, physical features suggest the site is underlain by the poorly drained Wallasea association. Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.12</th>
<th>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Open fields with slight slop down to the river. Any development would be visible from south against backcloth of village development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Countryside comments: NOT suitable for development : incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Area has High LandMAP values and SLA 4 River Usk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16/02/2012
### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:**
Small number of trees, some hedgerows. Protected by Conservation Area status.

**Council Response:**
Group and individual TPO ref: 84/mon TPO 84/Mon and Conservation Area.

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**
By careful integration into development layout.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:**
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In known area of Roman settlement that is designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Directly adjacent to the Caerleon Roman amphitheatre also designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Major Restraint. Direct impact on scheduled ancient monument and on setting of scheduled ancient monument The area should not be allocated in LDP

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:**
No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Site's eastern boundary adjoins the River Usk SAC and SSSI.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Within land designated as Caerleon Conservation Area.

**Council Response:** Site is within Caerleon Conservation Area.

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** Yes development proposals unknown traffic statement required.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** By use of part of site as open space to integrate with nearby spaces.

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Caerleon Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 3.64Ha. Formal outdoor play facilities are located adjacent to this site and would share a common access route and associated parking facilities. The access etc would need substantial improvements if proposed leisure/housing development was established on this site. Depending on the density of the development onsite provision of equipped play may be required, with off-site provision contributions for formal play provision.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** Bus links pass nearby.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** 200m

**Council Response:** 400 metres to high street

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** At least 2 per hour.

**Council Response:** 10-20 min freq

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for leisure/recreation and residential on Broadway Farm, Caerleon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
- Representation Text: 6 kilometers
- Council Response: newport station

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
- Representation Text: 200 - 400m
  - 4 shops within this distance but spread within Caerleon centre.
- Council Response: 400 metres to post office
  - 750 metres to supermarket

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- Representation Text: By linking to existing network which serves town and local tourism.
- Council Response: National Cycle Route situated near to the site running through Caerleon.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- Representation Text: Within 200m
- Council Response: Various areas of open spaces throughout Caerleon.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- Representation Text: Yes.
  - Community facilities within Caerleon and Caerleon school on opposite side of Broadway.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- Representation Text: By incorporation and integration of proposed uses in this leisure oriented location.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- Representation Text: No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:** Immediately adjoining.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:**

**Welsh Water Comments**

**Sewerage**

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

**Nash Waste Water Treatment Works**

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303.C1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for leisure/recreation and residential on Broadway Farm, Caerleon

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Adjoing existing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response: Site does not adjoin existing settlement boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Would work with opportunities on similar adjoining land to provide more comprehensive leisure / recreation and residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.2 Site Owner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. 4 - 6 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. Change to urban development boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response: Change to settlement boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissons?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**
REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING FARM BUILDINGS WITH FIVE DETACHED DWELLINGS (OUTLINE)
90/0502 08/06/1990 Refused
No computer record

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.
Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response: Trees/Hedgerows on site should be retained where deemed beneficial for the enhancement or maintenance of biodiversity and green infrastructure.
SINC Oaktree cottage fields, Monmouthshire B Canals (Crumlin Arm); Newport Environmentaql Space (Policy CE33); Cefn Council Wood (East + West) is a SINC. It should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted.
The design of development should seek to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area. This could include the enhancement of the canal as a tourism attraction and the inclusion of tourist accommodation in the designations. This will also include the avoidance of any pollution to the watercourse.
It is recommended that there is no loss to community facilities, notably the allotments under site 1232.C1 and 53.C1. This part of the site should be retained as allotments.
The development of the settlement should seek to ensure that there is an appropriate range of local services and facilities within walking distance from residences, including health facilities.
It should be ensured that the development of the site incorporates walking and cycling routes to connect to the national cycle network as well as to services and facilities including employment and education.

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: The candidate site is a greenfield site in the countryside. Allocation of the land for a health facility would be contrary to the Council’s objective for the sustainable use of land. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. It is recommended that the candidate site is not allocated within the Local Development Plan for health use.

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Extension to Cwrt Camlas

Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: Cwrt Camlas, Rogerstone, NP10 9AF

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Representation Text: ST 281 884

Council Response: 328159  188388

Question: 2.4 Site Area

Representation Text: 3.0ha

Council Response: 2.9ha.

Question: 2.5 Brief Description

Summary: Proposed extension of Cwrt Camlas for health use complementary to children's centre.

Site: 16/ Cwrt Camlas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>321.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant site abutting built up area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed extension of Cwrt Camlas for health use complementary to children's centre.

**Question: 2.6** Current Use

**Representation Text:** Vacant site abutting built up area.

**Question: 2.7** Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:** Health use complementary to children's centre.

**Question: 3.1** Brownfield?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.10** Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11** Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:** No. Previously used as site compound for Cwrt Camlas development. Currently used for temporary grazing.

**Council Response:** Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. There is a low probability of BMV at this site. Most likely grade is 4 (046-04D). Slopes are limiting in the North of the site to subgrade 3b. Soils are poor and FCD's are very high (238).

**Question: 3.12** Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:** Open land on edge of built up area. Character changed as a result of adjoining residential and children's centre development.

**Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and fringe Public Open Space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Public Open Space, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13** Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Defining the southern and eastern boundary. No TPOs.

**Council Response:** Borders Conservation Area and TPO'd trees. Additional trees with TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14** Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:** Limited features, possible retention of boundary hedgerows/trees.

**Question: 3.15** Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Improvement of public footpath leading to long distance walk/cycleway.

**Question: 3.16** Archaeology?

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>321.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representation Text:

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Not within ASA. None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Not within Zones C1 and C2.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?
- **Representation Text:** No. 100m from track leading to Monmouthshire & Brecon Canal.

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
- **Representation Text:** No. Not that we are aware of.

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Listed building n/a
  Ancient monuments (next to fourseen locks)
  historic park n/a
  conservation area n/a
  Within Newport boundary

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>321.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

---

**Rep'n/Para/Policy** 321.C1  
**AccessnNo**  
**DateLodgd** 06/05/2009  
**Source** P  
**Type** P  
**Mode** W  
**Status** M  
**Status Modified**  
**Summary:** Proposed extension of Cwrt Camlas for health use complementary to children's centre.

**Representation Text:**  
The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

**Council Response:**  
Yes. Extension of existing residential roads adjacent to the site. Principal access via Cwrt Camlas and secondary access via Diwedd Camlas.

---

**Question:** 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?  
**Representation Text:**  
The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. The nearest equipped play provision and public playing fields are approximately 1.2Km from this development. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Council Response:**  
The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.

---

**Question:** 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?  
**Representation Text:**  
The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

**Council Response:**  
The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

---

**Question:** 4.2 Bus Route?  
**Representation Text:**  
250m on Highcross Road.

**Council Response:**  
250m on Highcross Road.

---

**Question:** 4.3 Bus Frequency?  
**Representation Text:**  
14 buses per hour (service numbers 5, 56, R1, R3 & R6).

**Council Response:**  
20-30 min freq

---

**Question:** 4.4 Railway Station?  
**Representation Text:**  
Newport and Rogerstone Stations are approx 3.5km from site.

**Council Response:**  
Newport 3.2km

---

**Question:** 4.5 Convenience Shop?  
**Representation Text:**  
14 locks convenience store 100m away on Cefn Walk. Also 500m to a Somerfield Store located on Highcross Road, as well as a Somerfield petrol station, hairdressers and vets.

**Council Response:**  
Garage and shops on high cross drive. 200m school 200m

---

**Question:** 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?  

---
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**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

*Representation Text:* Highcross Primary school is within walking distance of the site and employment opportunities are within walking and cycling distance.

*Council Response:* National Cycle Route to north of site.
Good access to NCN 47 -cond.
Flyways on high cross rd + controlled crossways.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

*Representation Text:* 300m Southwest of site recreation and sports ground adjacent to Cefn Wood.

*Council Response:* Newport Fugitives Athletic Club
Land of Tudor Crescent (Playground)
Cefn Wood Playing Fields and playground.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Highcross Primary School - 0.3km
Rogerstone Primary School - 0.9km

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

*Representation Text:* Improved helath use provision complementary to childrens centre.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

*Representation Text:* The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

*Representation Text:* No.
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**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**

- Welsh Water Comments

  **Sewerage**

  From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

  Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

  **Water supply**

  It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

  **Sewerage treatment**

  No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Council Response:**

- Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
  - Representation Text: Yes.

- Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
  - Representation Text: Complementary development to existing children’s centre.

  **Council Response:**

  Candidate site adjoins recently developed children’s centre and housing at Cwrt Camlas.

- Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
  - Representation Text: Opportunity for complementary development to existing children’s centre.

- Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
  - Representation Text: Yes.

- Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
  - Representation Text: Yes.
### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?

**Representation Text:** Yes. 1 - 3 years.

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Extension to settlement boundary and removal from Countryside.

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representation Text:** No. Council Response: Relevant planning history on adjacent sites:

**ERECRION OF 33NO. DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED DOMESTIC GARAGES, ROADS, SEWERS, DRAINAGE AND FOOTPATHS**

05/0051 / 08-Jan-2006 / GRANTED

NEIGHBOURS: Twenty responses have been received which raise objections on the following grounds:-
- increased traffic in an already congested area;
- loss of countryside designated as "green wedge";
- overlooking;
- loss of light;
- loss of view;
- loss of trees in hedgerow;
- foul drainage system not adequate to cope with increased flows;
- proximity of proposed house to existing ones;
- area used by bats and other wildlife;
- disturbance caused by construction;
- lack of facilities for youths in area;
- were not consulted on proposal.

### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
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**Question: 9 Map Included?**

*Representation Text:* No.

*Representation Text:* Yes.
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### 329

**Attewell and S Gardner, Mr L H**

**Agent:** Bruton Knowles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>329.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed development of land at Quat Point, Magor for employment uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 47/ Quay Point, Magor

### Question: SA Recommendation

- It is recommended that only the land that is previously developed is reused for the development proposals.
- cSINCs - Spencer Works 3, Elver Pill Reen and Grasland and Pond, and Greenmoor Pool. Development on the site should seek to connect to and enhance the ecological value of the area. It is recommended that any development likely to harm the environmental designations or protected species should not be permitted.
- SSSI - Gwent Levels. Development should seek to enhance the landscape character of the area.
- Water quality should be maintained.
- Development should ensure ease of access by public transport.
- The mix of uses should ensure that a full range of community facilities is provided as part of development.
- Proposals for energy from waste should seek to minimise air pollution.
- Within The Levels ASA and within close proximity to Wilcrick Hill Fort Schedule Ancient Monument: it is recommended that development is not permitted where it may negatively affect the ASA, SAM, or Gwent Levels designations.

### Question: Overall Council Response

- Site intrudes into countryside area, not related to development on the Newport side of the boundary.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

- Representation Text: Land adjoining Quay Point

### Question: 2.2 Location

- Representation Text: Major

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

- Council Response: 340904  187397

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

- Representation Text: 6.66ha
- Council Response: 6.84ha

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

- Representation Text: Agricultural land adjoining Quay Point.

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
### Proposed development of land at Quat Point, Magor for employment uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>329.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed development of land at Quat Point, Magor for employment uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
- Representation Text: No.

#### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
- Representation Text: No.

#### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
- Representation Text: Unknown.
- Council Response: Welsh Government comment: There is a low probability of BMV at this site. However the soil picture is complex in this area meaning that our confidence is low but indications such as the pond suggest poorly draining soils. This is further supported by a pre revision survey of the site which found a mosaic of subgrades 3a and 3b. Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.

#### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

#### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
- Council Response: Yes. Incorporated into any development.

#### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
- Representation Text: Yes. Site is large enough.

#### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
- Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

#### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
- Representation Text: Yes.

#### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>329.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed development of land at Quat Point, Magor for employment uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Part or all of site is within Zone C1.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
Representation Text: No. Not to our knowledge.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
Representation Text: Listed building n/a
Council Response: Ancient monuments within/on border
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
Representation Text: No. Access through existing employment site.
Council Response: Yes via and green lane unsuitable access not known ta required.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
Council Response: The Llanwern Ward has a shortfall in play space of 1.52Ha. Any future residential development will only add to the shortfall therefore should the land use change there will be a requirement to make some provision for outdoor play facilities.
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<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
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<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>329.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed development of land at Quat Point, Magor for employment uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

Council Response: 2.5km to Magor rd  
1.8km to Redwick

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

Council Response: 1-2 hour freq

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

Council Response: newport railway station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

Council Response: 3km to Magor square

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

Council Response: on site provision

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

Council Response: Yes.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

Council Response: Bishton - informal and playground.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

Council Response: Yes. Magor

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

Council Response: No.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Council Response: No.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

Council Response: enlargement of existing employment designation.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Council Response:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
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<th>Type</th>
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<td>329.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td>P P</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation Text: Yes. We believe so in conjunction with existing.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelwork’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>329.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed development of land at Quat Point, Magor for employment uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Separated by existing employment allocation.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**
- **Council Response:** Divorced from the settlement boundary, situated on the edge of the authority boundary.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Already designated for employment use.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. 4yrs and as requires. Adjoining land to be developed in full.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Employment use.
- **Council Response:** Change to settlement boundary and countryside designation required.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** DEVELOPMENT OF THEME PARK & LEISURE COMPLEX INC. COVERED THEMED AREA, FESTIVAL VILLAGE, HOTELS, HOLIDAY VILLAGE, CONFERENCE FACILITIES, FILM STUDIOS, NEW AND IMPROVED ACCESS (INC. TUNNELS UNDER THE M4), AND CAR PARKING, ADMINISTRATIVE AND STAFF ACCOMMODATION 98/1150 23/12/1999 REFUSED. Consultation Responses - NOT AVAILABLE.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>329.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:** Land is adjoining employment site in Monmouthshire County Council. Representations have been made with MCC re: adjoining land which could also be brought forward.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
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<th>Type</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>333.C1</td>
<td>333.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed development of land NE of Coldra Roundabout for leisure, recreation and commercial use.

---

### Site: 37/ N E of Coldra

**Question:** SA Recommendation

- Mixed use scheme on one portion of site- mix of uses should include a new village centre to include convenience shopping, health centre, post office, and educational facilities. Further investment in well off areas may increase inequalities across the plan area: It should be ensured that the benefits of the scheme are realised for the entire community through sustainable accessibility provision. It is recommended that the site be developed to link and promote accessibility by walking and cycling, including connection to wider routes, connecting the area to the city.

- Development would lead to an increase in traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution. Potential noise pollution from A48 adjacent to site: these effects should be mitigated as part of any development which may include the use of vegetative buffers.

- Although not in a high flood risk zone, it is recommended that the development include SUDS to ensure that there is no net increase in surface water runoff, to reduce the risk of an increase in flooding.

**Council Response:**

- The site is considered part of the landscape setting for Langstone Park and in particular the Hotel. The retention of the wedge of open land complements the protected Coldra Woods and the wooded land adjoining the A449. Development of the site would not enhance the environment of Langstone Park and the local area. The issue of the development was considered and rejected in Planning Appeal 91/0853 and circumstances have not changed sufficiently to warrant reconsideration.

- The Inspector chose not to allocate this land at the time of the UDP Inspectors Report in August 2005 and circumstances have not changed sufficiently to warrant reconsideration.

- It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

---

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land NE of Coldra Roundabout, Langstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Question: 2.2 Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land adj. A48/A449, Langstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3361 1899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Council Response   | 336149 189852 |

---

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Council Response   | 1.16ha    |
Summary: Proposed development of land NE of Coldra Roundabout for leisure, recreation and commercial use.

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

Representation Text:

2 small field enclosures.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

Representation Text:

Agriculture (occasional - difficult to farm because of isolation).

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text:

Leisure/recreation/commercial

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

Representation Text:

No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text:

No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text:

Yes. Classification not known.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Representation Text:

Open fields enclosed by woodland to west and large hotel mature field boundaries could remain incorporated into development, inevitably development would be visible from A48 & A449.

Council Response:

Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. Detail design to retain and enhance surrounding hedgerow vegetation / screening.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

Representation Text:

Yes. Yes but not protected.

Council Response:

TPOs - 14/mon - several trees consisting of oak, ash and birch. Adjacent to Coldra Wood, TPO 14 Mon, and individual trees in site with TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

Representation Text:

Development could retain most of existing landscape features.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

Representation Text:

No. Limited scale of site in relation to scale of adjoining developments would be insignificant.
### Summary

Proposed development of land NE of Coldra Roundabout for leisure, recreation and commercial use.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
- **Representations Text:** None known. No reason for not allocating LDP.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating LDP.

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
- **Representations Text:** Yes.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
- **Representations Text:** No.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
- **Representations Text:** No.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
- **Representations Text:** No.

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
- **Representations Text:** No.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?
- **Representations Text:** No.

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
- **Representations Text:** No.

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
- **Representations Text:** Listed building n/a
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park n/a
  - conservation area n/a
  - Within Newport boundary

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

---
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Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Summary: Proposed development of land NE of Coldra Roundabout for leisure, recreation and commercial use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>333.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Council Response:**
yes access too close to Coldra Roundabout on dual carriageway.
Policy objection to access out A48 as principal road.
Existing field access
sub standard

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
Open space could be provided as part of development.

**Council Response:**
The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
Bus route passes site.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
Immediately passes site.

**Council Response:**
westbound 250m
eastbound 300m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
Hourly with more frequent link on otherside of Coldra.

**Council Response:**
good 20-30 min freq

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
Approx 5 Kilometres.

**Council Response:**
newport station 5 miles

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
1 Kilometer (Royal Oak) 2 (PO and convenience store) Tesco Extra a little further on.

**Council Response:**
chepstow road (via Coldra interchange) 1.4km garage shop langstone 2km

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
Adjoins hotel complex and factories/offices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>333.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed development of land NE of Coldra Roundabout for leisure, recreation and commercial use.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- **Representation Text:** Footpath links currently being upgraded.
- **Council Response:** on site infrastructure & facilities

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** 394/80

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- **Representation Text:** 1.5 kilometer
- **Council Response:** Langstone Recreation Ground and 2 sites of informal open space on The Nurseries.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Village hall in Langstone. Schools and other community facilities in Ringland.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- **Representation Text:** More jobs or recreational facilities could be provided locally without making inroads on open countryside.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- **Representation Text:** Adjoining.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments
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Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
### Representation & Council Responses Juxtaposed

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>333.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed development of land NE of Coldra Roundabout for leisure, recreation and commercial use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. Immediately adjoins hotel and employment development.</td>
<td>Adjoins leisure (hotel) and employment allocation and settlement boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.2 Site Owner?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. 1-3 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Change to urban boundary.</td>
<td>Change to settlement boundary and countryside designation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT OF CLASS B1 AND HOTEL WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING PERMISSION TO DEVELOP LAND WITHOUT COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITION 2 OF 1/17298 91/0853 01/11/1991 GRANTED USE OF LAND FOR CLASS B1 (OFFICE/LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) USE 89/0141 06/10/1989 REFUSED USE OF SITE FOR HOTEL B1 B2 &amp; B8 USES (OUTLINE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>333.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed development of land NE of Coldra Roundabout for leisure, recreation and commercial use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90/1139 14/01/1991 WITHDRAWN

CHANGE OF USE FROM HOTEL AND CLASS B1 USE TO HOTEL AND USE CLASSES B1 B2 AND B8
90/0386 22/03/1991 WITHDRAWN

ERECITION OF A TWO STOREY CLASS B1 BUILDING. DETAILS TO COMPLY WITH OUTLINE PERMISSION 1/17298
90/0710 20/08/1990 N/A
IN ABEYANCE

ERECITION OF A TWO STOREY 20 NO. BEDROOM EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY CONFERENCE FACILITIES
97/0478 24-Sep-1997 GRANTED

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text: There appears to be no logical reason for leading this isolated site undeveloped. It has np amenity value in its own right and is incapable of viable farming. Apart from the Coldra Wood which itself was isolated by major highway works, the site is surrounded by urban development.

Question: 9 Map Included?
Representation Text: Yes.
**Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Llwynhaid Farm (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site: 30/ Llwynhaid Farm (1)**

**Question**

**2.1 Site Name**

**Representation Text:**

- Land at Llwynhaid Farm (1)

**Question: Overall Council Response**

**Council Response:**

The candidate site is a greenfield site in the open countryside, with the Malpas Brook SINC running through the site. The western edge of the site forms part of Special Landscape Area 1 – North of Bettws, having scored as an area of high value in LANDMAP assessment. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

Furthermore, additional housing land on a greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that the candidate site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation.

**Question: 2.2 Location**

**Representation Text:**

- Land at Llwynhaid Farm, Parc-Y-Brain Road, Bettws.

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

**Representation Text:**

- ST 282901

**Council Response:**

328130 190243
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at Llwynhaid Farm (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.4</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>28.16ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>28.4ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.5</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Adjacent to settlement boundary and contained by Woodland to the South.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.6</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Pasture and grazing land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.7</th>
<th>Proposed Use(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.1</th>
<th>Brownfield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.10</th>
<th>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.11</th>
<th>Agricultural Land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Welsh Government comment: There is a moderate to low probability of BMV at this site. Slopes and soils are favourable. The maximum grade will be 2 on climate. A pre revision survey found the land to be Grade 3c. Moderate Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.12</th>
<th>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The site is well contained between the settlement of Bettws and the strong wooded boundary to the south. Development would not be intrusive and would be visible from a short distance at Ogmore Crescent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and fringe Public Open Space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of high value in LANDMAP. Proposed as part of SLA 1 north of Bettws. Public Open Space, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.13</th>
<th>Trees and Hedgerows?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Alongside the banks of the Brook. Site adjoins heavy woodland to the south.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Llwynhaid Farm (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Response: Ancient woodland (Forestry Commission map) borders this site. In the site hedgerows and individual trees TPO potential

Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
Representation Text: Retention of Bettws and associated trees.

Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
Representation Text: Yes. Along Bettws Brook.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Llwynhaid is a post-medieval farm and may have a medieval precursor. Fairly Significant Restriction. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
Representation Text: Yes. In small part - Zone C2 running immediately along Bettws Brook in the Western Section of the site. Mitigated by allowing sufficient buffer for development.

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
Representation Text: Yes. Bettws Brook

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.7 SSSI?
Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Malpas Brook cSinc runs through the site and Mescoed Mawr/Mescoed Bach cSinc adjoins the candidate site's western boundary.

Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
Representation Text: Not that we are aware of.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

*Representation Text:*

- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

*Council Response:*

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

*Representation Text:*

- Yes - Ogmore Crescent and emergency access Henlllys Lane. The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.
- Lane between Ogmore Crescent and High Cross.
- Transport assessment required.
- Rural lane - lack of footways and street lighting. Local highway improvement would be required to accommodate traffic.

*Council Response:*

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

*Representation Text:*

This proposed development spans Rogerstone and Bettws Wards that combined have a substantial shortfall of 4.91 Ha in equipped play. The existing play infrastructure would not be sufficient to cope with this size of development therefore on-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

*Council Response:*

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

*Representation Text:*

- The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.
- 150m from the site on Monnow Way
- Mannow way 200m edge of site.

*Council Response:*

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

*Representation Text:*

- 12 buses per hour (service number 16)

*Council Response:*

10-20 mins freq

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

*Representation Text:*

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Poly</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Llwynhaid Farm (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.5** Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** Newport station is approx 4 km, Rogerstone station is approx 4.2km.
- **Council Response:** Newport 4.3km

**Question: 4.6** Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** 1km to a Bettws shopping centre (a number of shops including a post office).
- **Council Response:** Bettws shops 1.2km 900m via footpaths.

**Question: 4.7** Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** The site is located circa 400m from Monnow junior and infant school, 1km from the Bettws social club and 1.3km from Bettws High School.
- **Council Response:** A number of local schools are within easy walking and cycling distance of the site.

**Question: 4.8** Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** 430m to recreational area east of site north of Monnow Way.
- **Council Response:** Lack of footways on lane improvement and on-site facilities would be required.

**Question: 4.9** Open Space?
- **Representation Text:** 430m to recreational area east of site north of Monnow Way.
- **Council Response:** Land off Lea Close and Roding Close.

**Question: 5.1** Schools?
- **Representation Text:** Monnow Junior and Infant School - 0.4km
  - Bettws Comp - 0.8km
  - Bettws Community Centre - 1km

**Question: 5.2** Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3** Community Aspirations?
- **Representation Text:** Improved mix and choice of housing.

**Question: 5.4** Loss of Recreational Facilities?
- **Representation Text:** No.
Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Representation Text: The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways. The foul water network requires upgrading.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text: Yes.

Council Response: Welsh Water comments

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Llwynhaid Farm (1)

developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
- Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
- Representation Text: Logical extension to the settlement of Bettws, well contained by strong defensible boundaries.
- Council Response: Adjoins the Bettws settlement boundary.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
- Representation Text: Stand alone development.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
- Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
- Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
- Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
- Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?
- Representation Text: Yes. 1 - 3 years.

Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?
- Representation Text: Boundary extension to Bettws and removal from countryside designation.
- Council Response: Changes to the settlement boundary and countryside designation.

Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
Relevant planning history on adjacent site:
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING
93/0850 08-Oct-1993 REFUSED

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
Representation Text: Yes.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: SA Recommendation**
Council Response:
Development should include the provision of open space for recreation within 300m walking distance for all residents. cSINC designations should be avoided included a substantial buffer area to protect important habitats and species. The development should include a convenience store to reduce the need for travel. Area of deprivation: it should be ensured that the local community benefits from the development. It should be ensured that no residential development is built within the flood plain or increases surface water runoff (net). It should be ensured that the woodland areas are not affected by development. It should be ensured that the tourism potential of the woodland areas for example is not lost through the development of the area for housing. Mixed use development could be encouraged, to improve local employment rates. Walking and cycling routes to areas of employment should be fully developed alongside safe routes to schools.

**Question: Overall Council Response**
Council Response:
The candidate site is a greenfield site in the open countryside, with the Malpas Brook SINC running through the site. The western edge of the site forms part of Special Landscape Area 1 – North of Bettws, having scored as an area of high value in LANDMAP assessment. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.
Furthermore, additional housing land on a greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context
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of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in
a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in
Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence
approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that the candidate site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed development of land at Llwynhaid Farm (2) for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

- **Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
  - Representation Text: The site is well contained between the settlement of Bettws and the strong wooded boundary to the south. Development would not be intrusive and would be visible from a short distance at Ogmore Crescent.

- **Trees and Hedgerows?**
  - Representation Text: Yes. Alongside the banks of the Brook. Site adjoins heavy woodland to the south.
  - Council Response: Ancient woodland (Forestry Commission map) borders this site. In the site hedgerows and individual trees. TPO potential.

- **Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
  - Representation Text: Yes. Retention of Bettws Brook and associated trees.

- **Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
  - Representation Text: Yes. Along Bettws Brook.

- **Archaeology?**
  - Representation Text: No.
  - Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Llwynhaid is a post-medieval farm and may have a medieval precursor. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

- **Greenfield?**
  - Representation Text: Yes.

- **Contaminated Land Risk?**
  - Representation Text: No.

- **Flood Risk?**
  - Representation Text: Yes. In small part - Zone C2 running immediately along Bettws Brook in the western section of the site. Mitigated by allowing sufficient buffer for development.

- **Adjacent to Water Course?**
  - Representation Text: Yes. Bettws Brook.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1117.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed development of land at Llwynhaid Farm (2) for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.7 SSSI?
Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Adjoins the Mescoed Mawr/Mescoed Bach cSinc and the Malpas Brook cSinc runs through the site.

Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
Representation Text: Not that we are aware of.

Council Response: There is a species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
Representation Text: Yes. Principal access onto Ogmore Crescent and emergency access onto Henllys Lane. The Highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

Council Response: Yes ogmore crescent.
Lane between ogmore crescent and high cross.
Transport assessment required.
Rural lane. Lack of footways and street lighting. Local highway improvement would be required to accommodate traffic.

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
Representation Text: The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.

Council Response: This proposed development spans Rogerstone and Bettws Wards that combined have a substantial shortfall of 4.91Ha in equipped play. The existing play infrastructure would not be sufficient to cope with this size of development therefore on-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
Representation Text: The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.
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### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
- **Representation Text**: 150m from the site on Monnow Way.
- **Council Response**: Monnow Way 200m edge of site.

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
- **Representation Text**: 12 buses per hour (service number 16).
- **Council Response**: 10-20 min freq

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Representation Text**: Newport station is approx 4 km Rogerstone station is approx 4.2km.
- **Council Response**: Newport 4.3km

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text**: 1km to a Bettws shopping centre (a number of shops including a post office).
- **Council Response**: Bettws shops. 1.2km 900m via footpaths.

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text**: The site is located circa 400m from Monnow junior and infant school, 1km from the Bettws community centre, 750m from Bettws social club and 1.3km from Bettws High School.

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text**: A number of local schools are within are within easy walking and cycling distance of the site.
- **Council Response**: Lack of footways on lane improvement and on-site facilities would be required.

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text**: Yes.
- **Council Response**: PROW ref 406/2 & 387/2 387/23 406/23

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?
- **Representation Text**: 430m to recreational area east of site north of Monnow Way.
- **Council Response**: Land off Lea Close and Roding Close.

### Question: 4.10 Schools?
- **Representation Text**: 16/02/2012 Page 343 of 968

---

**Summary:** Proposed development of land at Llwynhaid Farm (2) for residential purposes.
### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
- **Representation Text:** Improved mix and choice of housing.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
- **Representation Text:** The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways. The foul water network requires upgrading.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

#### Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

#### Sewage treatment
These sites will drain to our Nash waste treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.4</th>
<th>Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.5</th>
<th>Logical Extension?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Logical extension to the settlement of Bettws. Well contained by strong defensible boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.6</th>
<th>Precedent Setting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Stand alone development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.1</th>
<th>Site Owned by Proposer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.2</th>
<th>Site Owner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.3</th>
<th>Interest in Adjoining Land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1117.C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. 1-3 years.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Boundary extension to Bettws and removal from countryside designation.
- **Council Response:** Requires changes to the settlement boundary and countryside designation.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING 93/0850 08-Oct-1993 REFUSED

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Agent: Boyer Planning - Cardiff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1232.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential and existing education development on land at Queens Hill School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: 48/ Queens Hill School

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
Trees/Hedgerows on site should be retained where deemed beneficial for the enhancement or maintenance of biodiversity and green infrastructure.
Potential loss of school playing fields- compensatory provision should be provided.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Allt Yr Yn. The site is not recommended for inclusion within the Local Development Plan given the uncertainty over the timing of the release of the land.

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Queens Hill School

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Queens Hill School, Queens Hill.

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 307886

**Council Response:** 330706 188578

**Question:** 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** 4.45Ha

**Council Response:** 4.44ha

**Question:** 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** Level plateau, Tarmac Yard, Former school buildings and playing fields within settlement boundary.

**Question:** 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:** Former school site and existing school.

**Question:** 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:** New residential and existing education.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.1</th>
<th>Brownfield?</th>
<th>Yes. Former School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.10</td>
<td>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.11</td>
<td>Agricultural Land?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.12</td>
<td>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
<td>Contained urban landscape. Infill development of the site would not be intrusive. Site has potential for Public Open Space benefit. Visual impact and tree issues to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.14</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
<td>Limited landscape / biodiversity features on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.15</td>
<td>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.16</td>
<td>Archaeology?</td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.2</td>
<td>Greenfield?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.3</td>
<td>Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.4</td>
<td>Flood Risk?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed residential and existing education development on land at Queens Hill School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1232.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed residential and existing education development on land at Queens Hill School

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response:
- Listed building (1 listed building)
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?
Representation Text: Yes. Improvements to existing vehicular access onto Queen’s Hill. There is an existing pedestrian/cyclist access into St Mark’s Crescent. The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.
Council Response:
- Existing access sub standard
- Improved access required
- Providing 4.5 x43 metres vis splay. Steep site.

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?
Representation Text: The proposed development falls within the Allt-Yr-Yn Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 7.61Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development, combined with off-site contribution for formal play, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1232.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> 4.11</td>
<td><strong>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. There is scope for additional bus stop facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> 4.2</td>
<td><strong>Bus Route?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>Within 200m on St Mark's Crescent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>adjacent to site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> 4.3</td>
<td><strong>Bus Frequency?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>4 buses per hour (service numbers 5 &amp; 14C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>30 min - 1hr service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> 4.4</td>
<td><strong>Railway Station?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>Newport Station is 200m from site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>newport station 300m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> 4.5</td>
<td><strong>Convenience Shop?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>100m to express AJS store. One shop at this location. Also 250m to supermarket, within walking distance to town centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>Malpas district centre 700 metres city centre 400 metres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> 4.6</td>
<td><strong>Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>St Marys Primary School will remain on site. The site is very accessible it is located approximately 300m to the north of Newport City Centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> 4.7</td>
<td><strong>Walking and Cycling?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>All local services and facilities are located within easy walking distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>on site provision + infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> 4.8</td>
<td><strong>Public Rights of Way?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> 4.9</td>
<td><strong>Open Space?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>700m to a local recreation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>Sorrell Drive - Multipurpose, informal and playground.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1</strong> Schools?</td>
<td>Yes. St Mary's Primary School on site Newport University College - 0.6km Close proximity to Newport City Centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2</strong> Community Engagement?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3</strong> Community Aspirations?</td>
<td>Improved mix and choice of housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.4</strong> Loss of Recreational Facilities?</td>
<td>No. Former school - facilities relating to sport and playground were removed when school closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.1</strong> Infrastructure Proximity?</td>
<td>The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.2</strong> Neighbouring Development Issues?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.3</strong> Infrastructure Capacity?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comment by Welsh Water Sewage*

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.
It is unlikely that our Kingsway and Melbourne pumping stations can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
Representation Text: Logical infill development.
Council Response: Within settlement boundary.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
Representation Text: Stand alone development.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1232.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential and existing education development on land at Queens Hill School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.4  Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5  Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. 1-3 years

**Question: 7.6  Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** No. Within settlement boundary - removal from education designation.
- **Council Response:** Removal of education designation.

**Question: 7.7  Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.8  Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9  Planning Applications Pending?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 9  Map Included?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Site: 5/ Bethesda Close, Rogerstone
### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

- Trees/Hedgerows on site should be retained where deemed beneficial for the enhancement or maintenance of biodiversity and green infrastructure.
- SINC Oaktree cottage fields, Monmouthshire B Canals (Crumlin Arm); Newport Environmental Space (Policy CE33); Cefn Council Wood (East + West) is a SINC. It should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted.
- The design of development should seek to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area. This could include the enhancement of the canal as a tourism attraction and the inclusion of tourist accommodation in the designations. This will also include the avoidance of any pollution to the watercourse.
- It is recommended that there is no loss to community facilities, notably the allotments under site 1232.C1 and 53.C1. This part of the site should be retained as allotments.
- The development of the settlement should seek to ensure that there is an appropriate range of local services and facilities within walking distance from residences, including health facilities.
- It should be ensured that the development of the sites incorporates walking and cycling routes to connect to the national cycle network as well as to services and facilities including employment and education.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

Planning permission for residential development on the site (ref:11/0590) was refused during October 2011, in order to protect the open space as an amenity area. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations on greenfield sites cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

The western, smaller parcel of land are protected as allotments. Development of this land for residential use would be contrary to government and council policy which seeks to protect allotments from development.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:**

- Land at Bethesda Close.

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:**

- Land at Bethesda Close, Rogerstone, NP10 95X.

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**

- ST 270 886

**Council Response:**

327088 188635

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:**

- 1.6ha

**Council Response:**

1.57ha
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gently sloping site adjacent to built up area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Pony paddock and allotments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td>Residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Brownfield?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Agricultural Land?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
<td>Contained urban infill. Development of the site would not be intrusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>TPO'd woodland and trees with TPO potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
<td>Provision of relocated allotments on site and no impact upon Cefn Wood which will remain as a strong landscape feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Archaeology?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep’n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1232.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at Bethesda Close, Rogerstone.

- **Question:** 3.2 Greenfield?
  - **Representation Text:** Yes.
  - **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

- **Question:** 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** 3.4 Flood Risk?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** 3.7 SSSI?
  - **Representation Text:** Yes. Newport Environmental Space (Policy CE33)

- **Question:** 3.8 Protected Species?
  - **Representation Text:** Not that we are aware of.

- **Question:** 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
  - **Representation Text:** No.

- **Question:** 4.1 Access to Highway?
  - **Representation Text:** Yes. Extension of Bethesda Close, an existing residential road.
  - **Council Response:** The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

- **Question:** 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

---

16/02/2012
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at Bethesda Close, Rogerstone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1232.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Representation Text:
The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.

#### Council Response:
The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. There is no play space in the immediate area, the nearest site being 1.2Km with the local highway infrastructure not having any controlled crossing points on route. Therefore a LEAP provision would be requested on-site to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development.

#### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

**Council Response:**
Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

- 60m on the B4591 Cefn Road.

**Representation Text:**
- The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

**Council Response:**
Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

- 60m on the B4591 Cefn Road.

**Representation Text:**
- 12 buses per hour (service numbers 5, 56, R1 and R3).

**Council Response:**
Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

- 12 buses per hour (service numbers 5, 56, R1 and R3).

**Representation Text:**
- 20-30 mins freq

**Council Response:**
Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

- 20-30 mins freq

**Representation Text:**
- Rogerstone railway station in circa 1.7km.

**Council Response:**
Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

- Rogerstone railway station in circa 1.7km.

**Representation Text:**
- Local shops including a post office are located at St John's Crescent and Ebenezer Drive approx 500m away and a Tesco Metro has planning permission approx 200, from the site.

**Council Response:**
Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

- Local shops including a post office are located at St John's Crescent and Ebenezer Drive approx 500m away and a Tesco Metro has planning permission approx 200, from the site.

**Representation Text:**
- Wern industrial estate is adjacent to the site. Local schools are within reasonable walking and cycling distance.

**Council Response:**
Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

- Wern industrial estate is adjacent to the site. Local schools are within reasonable walking and cycling distance.

**Representation Text:**
- There is a good standard of combined footway/ cycleways adjacent to the site, located on the B4591 Cefn Road.

**Council Response:**
Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

- There is a good standard of combined footway/ cycleways adjacent to the site, located on the B4591 Cefn Road.

**Representation Text:**
- National Cycle Route runs along the western boundary of the candidate site.
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- **Representation Text**: No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- **Representation Text**: There is open space adjacent to site to the north of Cefn Road.

- **Council Response**: Cefn Wood Playing fields, but various other playspaces and playgrounds throughout Rogerstone.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

- **Representation Text**: Yes. Rogerstone Primary School - 0.38km
  Mount Pleasant Primary School - 0.6km

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

- **Representation Text**: No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

- **Representation Text**: Improved mix and choice of housing.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

- **Representation Text**: No. Existing allotments would be relocated within the site.

- **Council Response**: Allotments and environmental space.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

- **Representation Text**: The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

- **Representation Text**: No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

- **Representation Text**: Yes.

- **Council Response**: Welsh Water Comments

  Sewerage

  From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling...
Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1232.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Bethesda Close, Rogerstone.

Representation Text: Yes. Within settlement boundary therefore no boundary change.
Removal from allotments and environmental space designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.9</td>
<td>Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question: 9  | Map Included?                     | Representation Text: Yes. |
**1309 Focus Property Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/P#/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1309.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at Channel View/Coal Pit Lane, Castleton.

**Site:** 87/ Channel View/Coal Pit Lane

**Question:** SA Recommendation

- Taken together the sites are likely to have a significant effect on the landscape and townscape as they pose a significant increase to the settlement.
- PROWs should be retained and enhanced.
- Sites should be surveyed for their potential for providing habitats for important species, and mitigation implemented where possible ahead of development. This is applicable to both brownfield and greenfield sites.
- Part of site is adjacent to a main road which could lead to noise pollution effects on residents. Further, proximity to the road may exacerbate an increase in traffic which will necessarily increase from such as substantial increase in housing in an out of town location.
- SAM adjacent to site (2065.C1) - it should be ensured that the setting of the site is not negatively affected by development.
- The sites could include some employment/mix use development to encourage local employment and reduce the need to travel.
- Dedicated walking and cycling routes should be created and enhanced, especially to connect the settlement with centres of employment.

**Council Response:**

- Site is in Green Belt separating Cardiff and Newport.
- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.
- The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council's strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council's strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.
- It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

- Site Name
  - Representation Text: Channel View/Coal Pit Lane, Castleton.
- Location
  - Representation Text: Land lying NW of Channel View, Castleton.
- Grid Reference
  - Representation Text: 324873  183295
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1309.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
- **Representation Text:** Approx 6.165 ha
- **Council Response:** 6.12ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- **Representation Text:** Land currently in agricultural use, raised and sloping upwards from A48.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text:** Farmland.

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text:** Residential.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Land classification not known.
- **Council Response:** Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. There is a low to moderate probability of there being BMV at this site. A pre-revision survey (036-85) found subgrade 3a in the far Eastern corner whilst the rest of the area was graded as subgrade 3b. The soils (Salwick) can suffer from seasonal waterlogging but are improvable.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** Poor. The site is sandwiched between A48 and A48(M). Most of the site is raised and barely visible from the adjacent roads.
- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Some trees and hedgerows - but not protected.
- **Council Response:** TPOs - ref GWT/104 - oak. Trees protected by TPO Gwent 104.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1309.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

Representation Text: Retention of trees and hedges within the site. Use for residential development would relieve other more sensitive areas from pressure.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

Representation Text: To a limited extent only.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1309.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Channel View/Coal Pit Lane, Castleton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Access to Highway?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes- channel view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coal pit lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Channel view- poor access onto A48. Substaned turning arrangements all A48. Safety concerns over increased generation. Coal pit lane - 60mph 2.4x 215m vis splays required no footways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</td>
<td>Part of this site could be dedicated as public open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. The nearest outdoor play facilities are 2.5Km away therefore on-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</td>
<td>Increasing the resident population of Castleton would increase the critical mass of passengers making public transport more viable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Bus Route?</td>
<td>Adjacent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A48- bus stops-450m edge of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Bus Frequency?</td>
<td>1 per hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-20 min frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Railway Station?</td>
<td>Several local shops are nearby in Castleton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>newport 9km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Convenience Shop?</td>
<td>garage + shop on A48 150m Marshfield shops 2.1km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
<td>Very accessible to both jobs and community services in Cardiff, Castleton and Newport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.7 | Walking and Cycling? | Close proximity to flat, quiet roads around Wentloog. | coal pit lane - no footways  
A48 substandard footways. |
| 4.8 | Public Rights of Way? | Yes. | PROW FP 399/6 & 399/7 |
| 4.9 | Open Space? | 100m | Marshfield Playing Fields  
R/O Mallards Reach (informal)  
The Meadows Marshfield (informal)  
Marshfield Dairy Site. |
<p>| 5.1 | Schools? | Yes. In Castleton. | |
| 5.2 | Community Engagement? | No. | |
| 5.3 | Community Aspirations? | The site has sufficient capacity to permit community development within it. | |
| 5.4 | Loss of Recreational Facilities? | No. | |
| 6.1 | Infrastructure Proximity? | Adjacent to site within A48. | |
| 6.2 | Neighbouring Development Issues? | No. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1309.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Channel View/ Coal Pit Lane, Castleton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**

Welsh Water Comments

**Council Response:**

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**

Southern boundary of candidate site adjoins Castleton village boundary. The rest of the site is divorced from the settlement boundary.

**Council Response:**

It is adjacent to existing development yet further expansion can be easily controlled.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

The boundaries of A48M and A48 are highly effective barriers to further redevelopment. Development can be controlled by Council accepting offer of land as a barrier.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Site Owner?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td>Yes. It could become available during any of these periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Development Boundary Change?</td>
<td>Requires changes to the settlement boundary, countryside and green belt designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (AFFECTING FOOTPATH NO. 6) 98/0466 11/08/1998 REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Planning Application Refusals?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other Information?</td>
<td>1. This is easily capable of enabling a phased development over the whole plan period. 2. The proposed Candidate Site (bounded red) is part of a larger area of land totalling approx 14.375ha, all of which is within single ownership. In order to ensure that this proposal cannot lead to ribbon development in the future, the landowner is proposing to donate all the remainder of the site (banded blue) to the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Map Included?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan
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1341 Weekes, Michael & Judy

Agent: Harmers Limited

Rep’n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
1341.C1 06/05/2009 P W M Summary: Proposed development of land south of Parc Seymour for housing and open space.

Site: 41/ Parc Seymour South

Question: Representation Texts

Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response:
- The proportion of housing to open space should seek to ensure the retention of local character and ecological value. This is especially the case for site 1341.C1 which includes a cSINC designation - it is recommended that the cSINC is retained as open space, and a buffer is created between development and the cSINC, as well as between development and the SSSI to the north.
- PROWs, TPOs and protected hedgerows should be enhanced throughout the sites.
- The provision of housing should include a convenience store on at least one of the sites.
- It is recommended that walking and cycling routes to key services and facilities including employment are enhanced as part of development proposals. Enhanced bus provision should also be considered to reduce the potential effect of traffic growth.

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response:
This is a green field site of Moderate to high landscape value outside (bordering) the settlement boundary of Parc Seymour.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: . Land to the South of Parc Seymour.

Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: . Parc Seymour, Penhow.

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Representation Text: . ST 412 916

Council Response: 341039 191545

Question: 2.4 Site Area
| Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1341.C1                                 | 06/05/2009                           | P      | W      | M      |       | Summary: Proposed development of land south of Parc Seymour for housing and open space. |

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

**Representation Text:**

Land suitable for village expansion to the south-east, excluding woodland.

**Council Response:**

6.3ha

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

**Representation Text:**

Unused.

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

**Representation Text:**

Housing and open space.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. ALC not known.

**Council Response:**

Welsh Government comment: High Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. This site has already been surveyed (050-93 Newport LDP). This survey found the Northernmost parcel to be subgrade 3b whilst the southern parcel is subgrade 3a.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Representation Text:**

Modest sized fields adjoining the urban fringe and separated from countryside by woodland. Lower fields bounded by roads on two side and housing in third. Upper fields adjoin existing housing and have sporadic trees. Visible from highways.

**Council Response:**

Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of Moderate to High value in LANDMAP. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

**Representation Text:**

Protected under the Hedgerow Regulations.

**Council Response:**

TPOs - 02/2002 (9 birch and 4 oak) 
11/mon group of 5 oak, 8 oak, 3 cherry and 3 ash. Broadleaved pole copice woodland consisting mainly of oak, birch and ash. Adjacent to protected woodland TPO 11 Mon and individual trees protected by TPO 73/Mon and 2/2002.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

16/02/2012
## Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Summary:** Proposed development of land south of Parc Seymour for housing and open space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.15** Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

Representation Text: Yes. Development would retain landscape corridors and structural open space would be an integral part of any layout.

**Question: 3.16** Archaeology?

Representation Text: No.

**Council Response:**
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In part of a medieval hunting park. Southern part may be crossed by line of Roman road. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2** Greenfield?

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 3.3** Contaminated Land Risk?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.4** Flood Risk?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?

Representation Text: No.

**Council Response:** cSinc - Seymour Avenue Field

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?

Representation Text: No.

---
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**Page 370 of 968**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed development of land south of Parc Seymour for housing and open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
**Representation Text:** Yes. Points of access at Parc Seymour Road and Seymour Avenue.
**Council Response:**
- Yes
- Site ubuting partial 30/50mph road, split visibility splay of 2.4 by 90 and 2.4 by 160. Capacity o.k. Transport assessment required.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
**Representation Text:** By increasing public access to on-site provision of open space.
**Council Response:**
- The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. A LEAP provision would be required on site to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development with off-site contributions for formal play locally.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
**Representation Text:** By locating development close to existing bus services.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
**Representation Text:** Adjacent.
**Council Response:**
- Westbound 100m
- Eastbound 90m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
**Representation Text:** Hourly.
**Council Response:**
- Good 20-30 min freq

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
**Representation Text:** 3 miles.
**Council Response:**
- Newport station 8 miles

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
**Representation Text:** 1 shop available within 400m.
**Council Response:**
- 400 metres to Penhow stores
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed development of land south of Parc Seymour for housing and open space.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

*Representation Text:* 
- <3km Magor and Eastern Expansion Area.
- <5km Newport Retail Park.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

*Representation Text:* 
- By a location within cycling distance of services in layout design.

*Council Response:* on site infrastructure and facilities

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

*Representation Text:* 
- Yes.

*Council Response:* PROW - 402/402/5

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

*Representation Text:* 
- Within 50m

*Council Response:* Rockfield playground, playing fields and informal

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

*Representation Text:* 
- Yes. Public house <50m

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

*Representation Text:* 
- No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

*Representation Text:* 
- By the provision of choice in housing opportunities, and increased access to open spaces.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

*Representation Text:* 
- No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

*Representation Text:* 
- Immediately adjacent.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

*Representation Text:* 
- No.
Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text:

Yes.

Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text:

No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Logical Extension?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed development of land south of Parc Seymour for housing and open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site would extend the settlement to its logical limits as defined by peripheral woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjoins Parc Seymour settlement boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Precedent Setting?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It would remove pressure for more incongruous urban expansions into the countryside at other locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Site Owned by Proposer?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Other owner notified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Site Owner?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Interest in Adjoining Land?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Development of this unconstrained site would be expected to commence with 1-3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Development Boundary Change?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Countryside designation would require removal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires changes to settlement boundary and countryside designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Planning Application Refusals?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td>1341.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The land is promoted for village development that will contribute to the range and choice of housing opportunities available in Newport.

This will be critical if a skilled workforce is to be attracted to and retained in the area in line with economic aspirations. The village is located within easy cycling distance of the range of employment opportunities and services in east Newport and the planned Eastern Expansion Area at Llanwern. There is also a regular bus service within easy walking distance of the site.

Therefore, and despite the generally held view that village development is inherently unsustainable, the site is capable of delivering a range of housing and other community benefits at a location with existing infrastructure and which need not be dependent on private car travel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: SA Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>□ Mixed use scheme on one portion of site- mix of uses should Include a new village centre to include convenience shopping, health centre, post office, and educational facilities. Further investment in well off areas may increase inequalities across the plan area: It should be ensured that the benefits of the scheme are realised for the entire community through sustainable accessibility provision. It is recommended that the site be developed to link and promote accessibility by walking and cycling, including connection to wider routes, connecting the area to the city. □ Development would lead to an increase in traffic and subsequent air and noise pollution. Potential noise pollution from A48 adjacent to site: these effects should be mitigated as part of any development which may include the use of vegetative buffers. □ Although not in a high flood risk zone, it is recommended that the development include SUDS to ensure that there is no net increase in surface water runoff, to reduce the risk of an increase in flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: Overall Council Response</strong></td>
<td>The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8. It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.1 Site Name</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: Oak Court, Langstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.2 Location</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: Land between Catsash Road, the A48 (Newport / Chepstow Road), and Halse Garden Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.3 Grid Reference</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: 190200m and 337700m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: 337630 190323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.4 Site Area</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: 30 hectares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question: 2.5 Brief Description
**Representation Text:**
- Open land rising approximately 15m.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use
**Representation Text:**
- Grazing land (non-arable)

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
**Representation Text:**
- Mixed use; predominantly residential.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
**Representation Text:**
- No. This site has been kept in reserve for housing purposes.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
**Representation Text:**
- No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
**Representation Text:**
- Yes. Grazing land with mixed ADAS classification 3a, 3b and 4 (i.e. low to moderate quality).

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
**Representation Text:**
- Open landscape of average quality. Site surrounded by roads and established housing. Development would not be intrusive within visual range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countryside comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of Moderate to High value in LANDMAP. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
**Representation Text:**
- Yes. Not protected at present, but all will be protected as part of development scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPOs - woodland - 14/97 - mixed woodland comprising holly, hazel hawthorn, sycamore, birch, hornbeam, beech, ash and narrow leaved ash. TPO 72 Mon and 14/1997 plus additional TPO potential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
**Representation Text:**
- Proper and effective management of landscape and water courses.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
**Representation Text:**
- Yes. The majority of houses proposed will have gardens thus contributing to the enhancement of green space.
Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

Representation Text: No. A study by the Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust has confirmed that the Oak Court site is not affected.

Council Response:
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Pre-19th century field boundaries restraint. Archaeological assessment produced. Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. No reason for not allocating in LDP

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

Representation Text: Yes. Adjacent to water courses, also ditches (water courses) occur north/south on site.

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

Representation Text: No. No problems

Question: 3.7 SSSI?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

Representation Text: No. None, survey already carried out.

Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

Representation Text: No.

Council Response:
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
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## Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1343.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/04/2009</td>
<td>P P W</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed mixed use, predominantly residential development at Oak Court, Langstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representation Text:

Yes. Already proved in evidence laid before the UDP Inspector (See his Report).

### Council Response:

Yes - the council has a policy against new access onto Chepstow Road in the interest of highway safety and capacity. This has been the subject of a refused application 98/0192 roundabout.

Access on Chepstow Road has been acceptable full transport assessment required.

---

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**

- By prioritising pedestrian and cycle routes.

**Council Response:**

The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37ha. The proposed development is approximately 1.1km away from the existing play provision at its furthest most point and would not be able to sustain a development of this size. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the needs of the young people associated with this development the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:**

- Lay-by on main road, A48, also some services would be diverted (already agreed) on to site.

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:**

- On site (A48 frontage).

**Council Response:**

adjacent site

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:**

- 25 minutes (three routes)

**Council Response:**

good 20-30 min service

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:**

- 8km (5 miles)

**Council Response:**

newport station 5 miles

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:**

- 3km (2 miles) to Ringland Centre; five shops only.

**Council Response:**

garage shop - opposite side of Chepstow Road. Chepstow Road 2.7km (Royal Oak) underwood 3km

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:**

- Very accessible to school and Langstone Business Park, on foot, cycle car, and public transport.
Representation No: 1343.C1
Date Lodged: 05/04/2009

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
Representation Text: Layout provides real encouragement for walking and cycling.
Council Response: on site provision and infrastructure.

Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
Representation Text: Yes. Access to The Gorelands only 394/12, 14
Council Response: Footpaths 394/11, 394/12 and 394/14, 394/12, 14

Question: 4.9 Open Space?
Representation Text: Adjoining.
Council Response: Langstone Recreation Ground
The Nurseries northern site
The Nurseries southern site.

Question: 5.1 Schools?
Representation Text: Yes. School adjoining, but no community facilities in the immediate vicinity.

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
Representation Text: Yes. Community Councillor welcomes scheme especially the intended provision of community facilities.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
Representation Text: No. A real gain in these facilities is promised.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
Representation Text: All services adjoin site.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
Representation Text: No. Traffic will use a dedicated junction off the A48.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
Representation Text: No. Developer has agreed with Welsh Water to reinforce water supply and sewerage facilities here and throughout the EEA, and has made £2 million available for this.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments
Sewerage
Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Employment within 1km at Langstone Business Park; additional job availability will also be created within the proposed Oak Court Centre.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

The addition of critical mass will attract all the facilities currently lacking in Langstone, which is a key residential area with no real availability.

Adjoins Langstone settlement boundary.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1343.C1</td>
<td>05/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed mixed use, predominantly residential development at Oak Court, Langstone

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

*Representation Text:* This is a superb opportunity as the Oak Court site is the one remaining major site in this area, save a few infill sites nearby. Lack of housing in this area of Newport has always created demand that has outstripped supply.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. 100% in the ownership of the proposer.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Freeholder

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

*Representation Text:* No. Adjoining owners would all like to participate.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. None.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Site already recommended for development by UDP Inspector in his Report dated 2006. An immediate start on site is envisaged, certainly within a 1-3 year time frame.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. As agreed in discussions, Policy SP6 would be respected by containing development below the contour line off The Gorelands.

*Council Response:* Requires changes to the settlement boundary and countryside designation.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

*Representation Text:* No.

*Council Response:* DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR HOUSING AND VILLAGE CENTRE WITH ASSOCIATED ROADS, SEWERS AND RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE 98/0192 03-Feb-1999 REFUSED

DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR HOUSING A VILLAGE CENTRE AND ASSOCIATED ROADS AND LANDSCAPING 99/0780 08-Dec-1999 REFUSED

Relevant planning history on adjacent site:

(i) 95/1085 – DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR LOW DENSITY HOUSING (20 NO. DWELLINGS) ADJACENT TO FOOTPATH NO. 14 REFUSED – 23/02/1996

(ii) 97/0294 – ERECTION OF 31 DWELLINGS WITH ANCILLARY WORKS GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS – 22/04/1998
CONSULTATIONS WITH FILE
Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?

Representation Text:
No. Refusals were all prior to 2004.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

Representation Text:
No.

Question: 8 Other Information?

Representation Text:
A planning submission for this Langstone mixed-use development remains in an advanced state of readiness.

The Inspector in his 2005 UDP comments (see his Report) gave conditional support to the Oak Court scheme, but considered that the main thrust of the Council's case; i.e. based on Llanwern, should take precedence within the Plan Period. Apart from this comment, he (the Inspector) saw no objection in planning terms to the Oak Court proposals.

During the 2004/2005 UDP Inquiry, the Council's case was supported by the expert views of those representing Developers Gallaghers and St Modwen. Both Experts declared, under cross-examination, that housing delivery at Llanwern would commence in 2006/2007 and would provide growing numbers of new houses in the Plan Period to 2011. None of these have been provided, conversely the Oak Court Masterplan contemplated over 300 dwellings within the same timescale, an opportunity denied due to the Council's declared policy favouring Llanwern.

Subject to Council approval, the answer to question 7.5 is a resounding yes; Oak Court can, and will, be brought forward immediately to head-off the looming crisis in new housing availability; affordability and sustainability are key Oak Court objectives.

COVERING LETTER:
We enclose Candidate Site Form and Strategic Options Consultation data prepared upon instruction from our Client. The main thrust of these responses is to pave the way for the eventual inclusion of this Langstone site owned by Oak Court Estates (Langstone Mon) Limited.

In commending its inclusion within the Council's forthcoming schedule of LDP sites, it may be helpful to refer to the section of the Inspector's Report on findings raising from the recent UDP Inquiry. His Report, enclosed, is particularly supportive of the Oak Court case.

Against the current background of a catastrophic collapse in house building, we are asked to emphasise that the Oak Court site remains available for immediate development, is in the ownership of one Developer/Builder, and, as such, an early start on site would be a prime intent.

Reports are available in respect of Ecological, Agricultural, Archaeological, Landscape, and Highway Issues, as is a full site survey. It is our fervent hope that your Council will see Oak Court as a priority site that could be brought forward without delay; we await your comments.

Inspector's Report:
Oak Court (Objection Number 132.D3)

3.119 The Oak Court site is on the edge of the settlement of Langstone on the eastern side of Newport, close to the main built up area of the city. It is some 24ha in extent and is proposed as the site for a mixed use scheme consisting of some 360 dwellings, a new village centre with a foodstore and independent retail units, amenity space, a doctors surgery and a future primary school site.

3.120 The promotion of this greenfield site is based on the premise that further land will need to be identified in the Plan in preference to the housing sites allocated by the Council. I set out in Chapter 1(SP) of this report my reasons for concluding that the housing strategy and the selection of sites in the Plan is basically sound and that the selected sites will deliver the required number of houses in the plan period. The Plan’s housing strategy places emphasis on the
use of urban brownfield sites, an emphasis I recommend should be reinforced by the deletion of one greenfield housing site and the reinstatement of two large brownfield housing sites.

3.121 PPWales establishes that the development of brownfield housing sites is generally to be preferred to the development of greenfield housing sites (CD9 paragraph 9.2.7). However, it is common ground between the Council and objectors that greenfield land needs to be released for housing. The point at issue is where this greenfield land would best be located. In the Plan the allocated greenfield sites are located, for the most part, in the Eastern Expansion Area. I am satisfied that the development of these sites will assist in regeneration of the former steelworks site and help finance the provision of wider benefits. Again this is a matter I expand on in Chapter 1(SP).

3.122 The objector, who supports the concept of the Eastern Expansion Area, is of the opinion that the objection site is well placed to contribute towards the regeneration of the former steelworks by constructing a length of main sewer that could serve both the objection site and the former steelworks and by making a financial contribution towards the proposed eastern extension of the Queensway Link. I do not doubt that this is the case and that such an approach would not involve complicated agreement involving many parties.

3.123 However, I have already noted in Chapter 1(SP) the substantial progress the Council and landowners within the Eastern Expansion Area have made towards reaching the necessary agreements and it seems to me that the contributions to sewers and infrastructure proffered by the objector do no more than match those that will be expected from the other landowners.

3.124 The disadvantage of the objection site is that unlike the sites favoured by the Council it is not adjacent to the steelworks but some distance to the north of it beyond the M4 motorway. In this remote location it will not be in a position to contribute to or benefit from planned provision of a circular bus route through the Eastern Expansion Area, nor to make best use of the planned railway station or guided bus link. I acknowledge that the objection site is served by existing bus routes but its development would not assist in the provision of a high class public transport link between the steelworks and the City centre, something I regard as being of considerable importance.

3.125 At a less tangible level the remoteness of the objection site means that it would make little contribution towards ensuring an enhanced and unified sense of place at and around the former steelworks. The successful regeneration of the steelworks will depend on a willingness of people to invest in the area and to live in the area. This would, in my view, best be achieved by developing greenfield sites that are well related to the former steelworks. I do not consider the objection site falls into that category.

3.126 The objection site is not without its merits, a safe access to it could be provided, it could be serviced, it would not cause substantial harm in terms of its ecological, conservation or landscape effects and it is outside the floodplain. However, the same is largely true of the greenfield sites favoured by the Council in the Eastern Expansion Area.

3.127 Traffic travelling to and from the site would use the Coldra roundabout which at present is at or close to capacity. The objector considered that a foodstore, such as a Waitrose, on the site would intercept trips that would otherwise go through this roundabout and in this manner would reduce traffic using the roundabout. There was only sparse information in support of this point which does not appear to me to be entirely convincing. I see no reason why such a foodstore would not itself attract additional trips from the built up area of Newport to the west, trips that would add to the flows of traffic on the Coldra roundabout.

3.128 However, even if it is accepted that the development of the objection site would generate additional traffic, the amount of such traffic would, in the context of existing traffic flows on the Coldra roundabout, be relatively modest. With this in mind, and given that the eastern extension of the Queensway Link is likely to ease traffic on the Coldra, I do not regard the capacity of this roundabout to be an overriding objection to the development of this site.

3.129 The objector considers that recent housing development in Langstone has taken place in a piecemeal manner and the development of the objection site would help consolidate the settlement pattern, improve the provision of sewers and provide new facilities in the village. While that may be the case I do not consider that such benefits, or indeed the other merits of the site, outweigh the benefits of locating greenfield housing sites closer to the former steelworks site.

3.130 In the light of my conclusions as to the soundness of the housing allocations in the Plan I do not consider that a need has been demonstrated to allocate this greenfield site in the countryside for housing.
Representation Texts

SA Recommendation

- C2 in part of site: it is recommended that this part of the site is not developed and that green infrastructure is provided within the site to include SUDS.
- SINC designated areas; close to SSSI: buffer areas should be created to avoid potential harm to these sites.
- Primary facilities community hall and open space (inc. “various community facilities” unspecified) to be provided as part of development - suggest some employment is also provided as part of the development (this could be in the form of live/work units).
- Scheduled Ancient Monument; borders ASA: buffer areas free from development should be created if appropriate to retain the integrity and value of archaeological assets.
- May harm potential of tourism assets including historic and environmental features: it should be ensured that the potential of the area of tourism development is investigated and realised onsite.

Overall Council Response

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

Site Name

- Land at Ford Farm, Langstone.

Location

- Land north of M4, South of B4245.

Grid Reference

- 338 190
- 338111 189883

Site Area

- 22.5ha approx
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed residential development on land at Ford Farm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
Representation Text: Open fields / some cultivated and sloping, south of New Inn.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
Representation Text: Agricultural.

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
Representation Text: Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
Representation Text: Yes. Classification not known.

**Council Response:** Welsh Government comment: There is a low probability of there being BMV at this site. Slopes limits the grade to 3b over large areas and the poorly drained Worcester soils are unlikely to Grade better than 3a.

Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
Representation Text: Site comprises open fields with strong hedgerow boundaries. Undulating land. Development would include retention of vegetation and be seen from south against backcloth of village development.

**Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of Moderate to High value in LANDMAP. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
Representation Text: Yes. Not protected.

**Council Response:** TPO - 14/mon - group consisting of 11 ash, 11 alder, 4 oak and 2 field maple.
TPO 14 Mon and trees with TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed residential development on land at Ford Farm,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape features could be retained within development.</td>
<td>Question: 3.15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td>Question: 3.16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology?</td>
<td>Question: 3.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.7 SSSI?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Site adjoins cSinc - Delbury Grasslands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site adjoins Langstone - Llanmartin Meadows SSSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.8 Protected Species?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Represents & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Ford Farm,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. In conjunction with adjoining land owned by I Neale (rep No. 1668).

**Council Response:**
- No. 3rd parts land required.
- The site should be considered with several other adjacent sites.
- Transport assessment required.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- Open space can be provided within a comprehensive site development.

**Council Response:**
- The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- Public transport passes site.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
- Passes site frontage.

**Council Response:**
- 500 metre over 3rd party land.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
- Hourly.

**Council Response:**
- Good 20-30 min service.

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
- Approx 8 kilometers.

**Council Response:**
- Newport station 6miles.

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
- 500m (by road) but immediately adjoins Hillcroft Garage convenience store.
### Summary

Proposed residential development on land at Ford Farm, Langstone garage 750 metre shop underwood shopping 2.5km centre

#### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** Employment centre at Coldra, Leeway/Spytty, Magor Brewery Llandevenny.
- **Council Response:**

#### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** By connection to local footpath network.
- **Council Response:**

#### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. See plan.
- **Council Response:** PROW - 394/1 & 394/2 394/ 19 , 23

#### Question: 4.9 Open Space?
- **Representation Text:** Non known in Langstone.
- **Council Response:** Langstone Recreation Ground The Nurseries - Northern site The Nurseries - Southern site

#### Question: 5.1 Schools?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Village hall in Langstone. Schools and other community facilities in Ringland.
- **Council Response:**

#### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**

#### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
- **Representation Text:** A comprehensive village development contributing to housing numbers could offer planning gain to the village.
- **Council Response:**

#### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**

#### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
- **Representation Text:** Immediately adjoining.
Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

No.

Representation Text: Yes. Might be deficiencies in foul drainage system. Contribution could be made to upgrade local system.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usageage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at Ford Farm.

should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Council Response:**

- Immediately adjoins village development.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**

- Adjoins settlement boundary.

**Council Response:**

- Provides opportunity for wider development as a rounding off opportunity south of the village.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. 4 - 6 years.

**Council Response:**

- Change to urban boundary.

**Question: 6.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 6.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Lateness</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed residential development on land at Ford Farm,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**

- This would provide a strategic development opportunity along the M4 corridor. It would not depend on vehicle capacity at the Coldra roundabout as it could have an easterly connection with junction 23A.

While the UDP has commitments at Llanwern, this site would provide a strategic alternative offering choice and variety of housing sites as encouraged by the Welsh Assembly Government.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Lateness</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for residential development on Ford Farm, Langstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 88/ Ford Farm (smaller area)

**Question: SA Recommendation**

- C2 in part of site: it is recommended that this part of the site is not developed and that green infrastructure is provided within the site to include SUDS.
- SINC designated areas: close to SSSI: buffer areas should be created to avoid potential harm to these sites.
- Primary facilities community hall and open space (inc. „various community facilities“ unspecified) to be provided as part of development: suggest some employment is also provided as part of the development (this could be in the form of live/work units).
- Scheduled Ancient Monument; borders ASA: buffer areas free from development should be created if appropriate to retain the integrity and value of archaeological assets.
- May harm potential of tourism assets including historic and environmental features: it should be ensured that the potential of the area of tourism development is investigated and realised onsite.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

**Council Response:**

- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>PPWM</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Ford Farm, Langstone development. The Council's strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.1</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Land at Ford Farm, Langstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.2</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Land north of M4, south of B4245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.3</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>338. 190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>338111 189883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.4</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>16.2 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>16.15ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.5</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Open fields / some cultivated and sloping, south of New Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.6</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.7</th>
<th>Proposed Use(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.1</th>
<th>Brownfield?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.10</th>
<th>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.11</th>
<th>Agricultural Land?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
Representations Text:
Site comprises open fields with strong hedgerow boundaries. Undulating land. Development would include retention of vegetation and be seen from south against backdrop of village development.
Council Response:
Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of Moderate to High value in LANDMAP. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
Representations Text:
Yes. Not protected.
Council Response:
TPO 14/mon group consisting of 11 ash, 11 alder, 4 oak and 2 field maple. TPO 14 Mon and trees with TPO potential.

Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
Representations Text:
Landscape features could be retained within development.

Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
Representations Text:
No.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
Representations Text:
No.
Council Response:
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
Representations Text:
Yes.

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
Representations Text:
No.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
Representations Text:
No.

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
Representations Text:
Yes.

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Ford Farm, Langstone
Yes. Classification not known.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for residential development on Ford Farm, Langstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:**
A small site (SSSI) adjoins at field 2074.

**Council Response:**
Site adjoins cSINC - Delbury Grasslands and Langstone - Llanmartin Meadows SSSI

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. In conjunction with adjoining land owned by I. Neale (rep No. 1668)

**Council Response:**
Yes this site should be considered in association with several adjacent sites.
Transport assessment will be required

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
. Open space can be provided within a comprehensive site development.

**Council Response:**
The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
. Public transport passes site.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
Passes site frontage.

**Council Response:**
adjacent site on magor road
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Ford Farm, Langstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

*Representation Text:* Hourly.

*Council Response:* good 20-30 minute service

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

*Representation Text:* Approx 8 kilometers.

*Council Response:* newport station 6 miles

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

*Representation Text:* 500m (by road) but immediately adjoins Hillcroft Garage convenience store.

*Council Response:*
- langstone garage 650 metres
- underwood shopping centre 1.9km

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

*Representation Text:* Employment centre at Coldra, Leeway/Spytty, Magor Brewery, Llandevenny.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

*Representation Text:* By connection to local footpath network.

*Council Response:* on site provision and infrastructure

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. See plan.

*Council Response:* PROW 394/1 & 394/2 394/19, 23

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

*Representation Text:* None known in Langstone.

*Council Response:*
- Langstone Recreation Ground
- The Nurseries Northern Site
- The Nurseries Southern Site

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

*Representation Text:* Village hall in Langstone school and other community facilities in Ringland.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

Representation Text:

A comprehensive village development contributing to housing numbers could offer planning gain to the village.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

Representation Text:

No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Representation Text:

Immediately adjoining.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text:

No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text:

Yes. Might be deficiencies in foul drainage system. Contribution could be made to upgrade local system.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from
Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Ford Farm, Langstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

*Representation Text: Immediately adjoins village development.*

*Council Response: Adjoins settlement boundary.*

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

*Representation Text: Provides opportunity for wider development as a rounding off opportunity south of the village.*

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

*Representation Text: Yes.*

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

*Representation Text: Yes.*

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Ford Farm, Langstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Change to urban boundary.
- **Council Response:** Changes to settlement boundary and countryside designation.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
- **Representation Text:**
  - This would provide a strategic development opportunity along the M4 corridor. It would not depend on vehicle capacity at the Coldra roundabout as it could have an easterly connection with junction 23a.
  - While the UDP has commitments at Llanwern, this site would provide a strategic alternative offering choice and variety of housing sites as encouraged by the Welsh Assembly Government.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1415.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 89/ Coach and Horses, Castleton

**Question:** SA Recommendation

- Taken together the sites are likely to have a significant effect on the landscape and townscape as the pose a significant increase to the settlement.
- PROWs should be retained and enhanced.
- Sites should be surveyed for their potential for providing habitats for important species, and mitigation implemented where possible ahead of development. This is applicable to both brownfield and greenfield sites.
- Part of site is adjacent to a main road which could lead to noise pollution effects on residents. Further, proximity to the road may exacerbate an increase in traffic which will necessarily increase from such as substantial increase in housing in an out of town location.
- SAM adjacent to site (2065.C1) it should be ensured that the setting of the site is not negatively affected by development.
- The sites could include some employment/mix use development to encourage local employment and reduce the need to travel.
- Dedicated walking and cycling routes should be created and enhanced, especially to connect the settlement with centres of employment.

**Council Response:**

- The site is in the green wedge adjoining the northern boundary of Castleton settlement. It represents an incursion into the open countryside.
- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.
- The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.
- It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

- Representation Text: Land to rear of Coach and Horses, Castleton.

**Question:** 2.2 Location

- Representation Text: Castleton, Newport.

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

- Representation Text: ST 252 836
- Council Response: 325199 \ 183701

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1415.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed residential development on land to the rear of Coach and Horses, Castleton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

- **Representation Text:** 2.4 ha
- **Council Response:** 2.09ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

- **Representation Text:** Land comprises rough scrubland with some trees and bramble, bounded by public house, Wye Vale Garden Centre and residential properties along Mill Lane.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

- **Representation Text:** Vacant.

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

- **Representation Text:** Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. There is a low to moderate probability of BMV. A pre revision survey found the land to be subgrade 3a. Slopes and climate are non-limiting however the high FCD's (220) reduce the likelihood of BMV.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representation Text:** The site is not intrusive and would only be visible from the A48 and M4.
- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** TPO Area - GWT/104 - various alder trees standing in the area A17. Trees protected by TPO Gwent 104
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1415.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land to the rear of Coach and Horses, Castleton.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

**Representation Text:** No hedgerows or trees would need to be removed or damaged and such features could be retained and enhanced.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** cSINC - Underpass Field

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Site adjoins the Coach and Horses Listed Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1415.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land to the rear of Coach and Horses, Castleton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Accessible from A48.

*Council Response:* Not considered accessible to the public highway
- No access potential.
- Unsuitable for development.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

*Representation Text:* On site provision.

*Council Response:* The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. A LEAP provision would be required on site to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, with off-site contributions for formal play locally.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

*Representation Text:* Via new site access.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

*Representation Text:* 100m along A48

*Council Response:* A48- bus stop adjacent is coach and horses.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

*Representation Text:* 40 minutes (service 30 - Cardiff to Newport)

*Council Response:* 10-20 min frequency.

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

*Representation Text:* Newport - 11 kilometres.

*Council Response:* Newport 5.6 miles

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

*Representation Text:* 350 metres
## Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:** Near main transport routes to Newport and Cardiff, including employment opportunities at Celtic Springs.

**Council Response:**

- Water mains on site - other services within 200m.

## Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

**Representation Text:** Path along A48.

**Council Response:**

- Path along A48.

## Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Council Response:**

- No access to public highway

## Question: 4.9 Open Space?

**Council Response:**

- Marshfield

## Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Council Response:**

- Primary school at Marshfield 1km from site.

## Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Council Response:**

- No.

## Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Council Response:**

- More housing to sustain local facilities.

## Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Council Response:**

- No.

## Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Council Response:**

- Water mains on site - other services within 200m.

## Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Council Response:**

- No.
Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text:
Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Logical Extension?

Representation Text:
It would represent infilling and rounding off of the village as it is contained by the M4 motorway and existing uses.

Council Response:
Site adjoins Castleton Village Boundary.

Precedent Setting?

Representation Text:
It would not represent an intrusion into the countryside or set a precedent due to the above.

Site Owned by Proposer?

Representation Text:
Yes.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1415.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed residential development on land to the rear of Coach and Horses, Castleton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
Representation Text: Yes. Within 1 to 3 years of start date of LDP.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
Representation Text: Yes. Inclusion in village boundary.
Council Response: Requires amendments to the Castleton Village Boundary, and the green wedge and countryside designations.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
Representation Text: 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Promotional Submission Statement has been prepared on behalf of Steve Richards who wishes to promote the submission site as a candidate site for consideration through the current exercise where representations are being invited. The site consists of vacant land to the rear of the Coach and Horses public house, Castleton.

1.2 The site is currently identified as being outside the village boundary for Marshfield/Castleton as identified in the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan but is bounded by existing residential development, the Wyevale Garden Centre, M4 motorway and aforementioned public house. It therefore presents an opportunity to accommodate a sympathetic form of development which would not represent an intrusion into the countryside and which would be compatible with the surrounding area.

1.3 This submission, therefore, in promoting the site for residential development, will provide a description of the site at Section 2, review the planning policies relevant to the site at Section 3, provides an appraisal of the development at Section 4 and draws together the key points and conclusions at Section 5.
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The submission site is located approximately 9 kilometres to the east of Newport City Centre, between the two principal route corridors of the M4 motorway and the A48. It lies adjacent to existing commercial uses in the form of a pub and garden centre. Other facilities in the form of a post office/shop, place of worship and primary school lie within walking distance. Regular bus services operate along the A48 between Cardiff and Newport.

2.2 The irregular shaped site is 2.4 hectares in area. It comprises gently sloping, south-facing vacant pasture-land which is overgrown by young trees, scrub and brambles.

2.3 The M4 motorway lies directly to the north above an embankment. To the south lies a car park, beyond which is the Coach and Horses Public House. Residential properties along Mill Lane lie to the west, whilst to the east is the Wyevale Garden Centre.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

3.1 The policy basis for this submission derives from the content and scope of national planning guidance. It is submitted that the proposed residential development would be in accordance with national advice and guidance.

3.2 National Planning Guidance
Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) is the principal document, which sets out the land use policy context of the Welsh Assembly Government, for the consideration and evaluation of all types of development.

3.3 Planning Policy Wales confirms at Paragraph 4.1.1 that the planning system:-
   "...is intended to help protect the amenity and environment of towns, cities and the countryside in the public interest while promoting high quality, sustainable development."

3.4 This advisory document confirms that a primary principle or basic premise of the planning system is that it:-
   "...must provide for an adequate and continuous supply of land, available and suitable for development to meet society’s needs. It must do this in a way that is consistent with overall sustainability principles and objectives..."  (Para 1.2.2)

3.5 Planning Policy Wales promotes the notion of sustainable development as being central to all planning decisions in Wales. It defines sustainable development as:-
   "...development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." (Para. 2.1.1)

3.6 Paragraph 2.1 reiterates the duty placed on the Assembly, under Section 121 of the Government of Wales Act 1998, to promote sustainable development in the exercise of its functions. The Welsh Assembly Government is promoting sustainable development planning by placing sustainability at the heart of its decision-making process, through its strategic policies, including Planning Policy Wales (March 2002).

3.7 The document outlines a number of relevant sustainable development principles, chief amongst which is the promotion of resource efficient settlement patterns and minimising land-take. There is also recognition that the location of development should aim to reduce demand for travel, especially journeys by private car.

3.8 Similarly, in terms of providing a framework for the provision of housing, one of the key policy objectives of Planning Policy Wales is to:-
   "Ensure that all local communities - both urban and rural - have sufficient good quality housing for their needs..."  (Para. 2.3.2)

3.9 Section 2.5 provides guidance for local authorities in achieving a sustainable settlement strategy in locating new development. It states that in their land allocation policies, local planning authorities should:-
   • "Promote sustainable patterns of development"
• Maintain and improve the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town, district, local and village centres.
• Foster development approaches that recognise the mutual dependence between town and country, thus improving linkages between urban areas and their rural surroundings."

3.10 Planning Policy Wales advises, in terms of the location of development in Paragraph 2.5.3, that:-
"Local planning authorities should assess the extent to which community settlement strategies and new development are consistent with minimising the need to travel and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car. A broad balance between housing and employment opportunities should be promoted to minimise the need for long distance commuting. Local authorities should adopt policies to locate major generators of travel demand such as housing, employment, retailing, leisure and recreation, and community facilities, including libraries, schools and hospitals within existing urban areas or in other locations which are, or can be, well served by public transport, or can be reached by walking or cycling”.

3.11 Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006 : Housing replaces Chapter 9 of PPW and provides the framework for national housing planning policy. Paragraph 9.1.1 states that the Assembly Government will seek to provide:-
"homes that are in good condition, in safe neighbourhoods and sustainable communities; and greater choice for people over the type of housing and the location they live in.”

3.12 and to ensure that:-
• “Previously developed land is used in preference to greenfield sites;
• New housing or residential environments are well designed, environmentally sound and make a significant contribution to promoting community regeneration and improving quality of life; and that
• The overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of social and market housing that retains and, where practical, enhances important landscape and wildlife features in the development.”

3.13 Paragraph 9.2.8 states that:-
"In identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, local planning authorities should follow a search sequence, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good public transport links.”

3.14 The MIPPS in paragraph 9.2.9 goes on to state that local planning authorities should consider the following criteria in deciding which sites to allocate for housing in their development plans:-
• The availability of previously developed sites and empty or under-used buildings and their suitability for housing use;
• The location and accessibility of potential development sites to jobs, shops and services to modes other than the car, and the potential for improving such sustainability;
• The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure, including public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals) to absorb further development and the cost of adding further infrastructure;
• The ability to build sustainable communities to support new physical and social infrastructure, including consideration of the effect on the Welsh Language and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities;
• Physical and environmental constraint on development of land, including for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk, taking into account that such risk may increase as a result of climate change, and the location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes; and
• Compatibility with neighbouring established land uses which might be adversely affected by encroaching residential development.

3.15 The emerging Local Development Plan will be required to review the existing planning framework provided by the UDP and to make provision for future housing needs.

3.16 The following section will seek to establish that national planning guidance is supportive of residential development taking place on the submission site, given its positive sustainable development characteristics. In these circumstances, therefore, it is submitted that these aspects should be taken into account when assessing the allocation of the site for residential purposes through the LDP site selection process.

4.0 APPRAISAL
4.1 The new Newport Local Development Plan (LDP) is required to place an emphasis on sustainable development, transparency in the site selection process and a robust evidence base. Newport’s current Unitary Development Plan period ends in 2011 when the new LDP period commences. In terms of housing land supply much reliance will continue to be placed on land to the east of the city, associated with the former Corus steelworks together with proposed greenfield releases around the village of Llanwern, ie the Eastern Expansion Area. Much of this land is dependant on major road linkages and there remains uncertainty over the timing of development.

4.2 Newport, has been successful in recent years in securing development on sites along the River Usk, Old Town Dock, Mon Bank Sidings and other sustainable locations where existing and proposed forms of development are contributing positively to enhancing the image of the new City. Selective releases will be required, however, in order to maximise housing land opportunities. These will need to include relatively small sites where appropriate forms of development can be accommodated which reflect the existing settlement pattern of the surrounding villages and where development can be accommodated which would not represent a major intrusion into the surrounding countryside.

4.3 As part of this and other submission representations are being made on behalf of my Client on the LDP Strategic Options (also subject to consultation) which favour the above approach.

4.4 This Section will consider the site in the context of established site selection criteria as identified in the national planning guidance described in the previous Section.

Consideration of the Site Against Established Site Selection Criteria

4.5 Planning Policy Wales and the Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/06 provide criteria for the identification of housing allocation sites as follows:

- The availability of previously developed sites and buildings;
- Accessibility to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car;
- The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure;
- The ability to build communities;
- Physical and environmental constraints;
- Compatibility with neighbouring land uses.

Availability of Previously Developed Sites

4.6 The site is not previously developed land but is surrounded by existing forms of residential and commercial development which are in turn contained by the M4 motorway. It would therefore ‘score’ highly in the search sequence referred to in paragraph 9.2.8 of Planning Policy Wales, as a settlement extension.

Accessibility

4.7 The site has sustainable credentials in that it is situated in reasonably close proximity to a range of services in Marshfield and Castleton including shops, a primary school, pubs and places of worship.

4.9 Bus services also pass close to the site along the A48. These include Service 30, Newport to Cardiff which operates on a 40 minute frequency Monday to Saturday. There is consequently good access to employment opportunities in both Cardiff and Newport, including the nearby St Mellons and Celtic Springs employment areas.

Capacity of Infrastructure

4.10 It is not anticipated that infrastructure provision presents a major obstacle to development (See attached representation form).

Ability to Build Communities

4.11 It is not anticipated that the development would have a negative impact on the community, including the Welsh Language.

Physical and Environmental Constraints

4.12 There are no major constraints to development subject to an appropriate form of access being achieved via land adjacent to the public house.

Compatibility with neighbouring, established uses
4.13 Residential development on the site would be fully compatible with adjacent residential uses to the west. A scheme which provides for a variety of dwelling types and which reflects the existing pattern of development would be appropriate on the site. It would meet accepted site selection criteria as highlighted above. It is, therefore, requested that favourable regard should be given to allocating the site for residential uses through the Local Development Plan process.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 This Promotional Submission Statement has been prepared on behalf of Steve Richards. The site consists of vacant, enclosed former pasture land which is overgrown.

5.2 A sympathetically-designed scheme would consolidate the existing settlement pattern on a site which has sustainability credentials in that it lies close to education, shop and leisure facilities, together with public transport routes which provide access to Newport and Cardiff City Centres and employment centres at St Mellons and Celtic Springs.

5.3 Section 4 described the extent to which the proposal accords with the relevant planning policies and in doing it is possible to conclude that the site represents an opportunity to provide housing at a location where a sympathetic form of development could be achieved which reflects the adjoining patterns of development.

5.4 In the light of all the aforementioned circumstances, it is considered that the proposed residential development at this location would be in accordance with national advice and guidance and also accords with accepted site selection criteria.

5.5 Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that in assessing Candidate Site Submissions in the emerging Newport Local Development Plan, the site in question is identified as a housing land allocation.

Asbri Planning Ltd
May 2009

Question: 9 Map Included?

Representation Text: Yes.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

1420 Corus UK Ltd

Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
1420.C1 05/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Regeneration of Llanwern Steelworks for number of uses that could include: general business and industry; offices; R&D, waste, energy and residential

Site: 25/ Llanwern Steelworks

Question: SA Recommendation
Council Response:
It is recommended that only the land that is previously developed is reused for the development proposals.
- cSINCs - Spencer Works 3, Elver Pill Reen and Grassland and Pond, and Greenmoor Pool. Development on the site should seek to connect to and enhance the ecological value of the area. It is recommended that any development likely to harm the environmental designations or protected species should not be permitted.
- SSSI - Gwent Levels. Development should seek to enhance the landscape character of the area.
- Water quality should be maintained.
- Development should ensure ease of access by public transport.
- The mix of uses should ensure that a full range of community facilities is provided as part of development.
- Proposals for energy from waste should seek to minimise air pollution.
- Within The Levels ASA and within close proximity to Wilcrick Hill Fort Schedule Ancient Monument: it is recommended that development is not permitted where it may negatively affect the ASA, SAM, or Gwent Levels designations.

Question: Overall Council Response
Council Response:
The greenfield part of the site is not proposed for allocation for development and will be allocated as countryside, but the tipped land to the south of Queensway is proposed for allocation for employment use. The operational steelworks site to the north of Queensway is not proposed for any change of use.

Question: 2.1 Site Name
Representation Text: 'New Llanwern', Newport.

Question: 2.2 Location
Representation Text: Queensway, Llanwern, Newport.

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
Representation Text: E:337925 N:186259
Council Response: 337771 186108

Question: 2.4 Site Area
Representation Text: Approximately 580 hectares.
Council Response: 589ha

Question: 2.5 Brief Description
Representation Text: Flat site that comprises the existing steel processing plant and related waste facilities, together with peripheral areas of undeveloped land.
Question: 2.6 Current Use

Representation Text: Steel processing plant to north of Queen's Way, together with employment and waste related land uses, and open areas to the south.

Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

Representation Text: Strategic regeneration opportunity that could accommodate the following uses:
- General business and industry;
- Offices, research and development facilities, either building on existing facilities or independently;
- New roads and infrastructure;
- Civic and institutional uses;
- Other mixed/commercial uses;
- Hotels and roadside uses;
- Waste recycling, energy and waste to energy facilities;
- Residential development (including elderly and student accommodation).

Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

Representation Text: Yes. The majority of the site is currently used as a steel processing plant together with employment and waste related land uses. Part of the site to the south of Queen's Way is not previously developed land.

Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

Representation Text: Yes. There are a number of farm business tenancy agreements in place to the southern perimeter of the site. These typically involve grazing of animals on a short hold agreement.

Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

Representation Text: The area comprises the operational steel processing facility to the north of Queens Way. The majority of the land to the south of Queen's Way is land used in association with the steel works site. Development would not be intrusive given the general industrial land uses within the surrounding area.

Council Response: Countryside comments: Site has potential for landscape improvement with Public Open Space benefit. Visual impact and tree issues to be considered at design stage.

Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

Representation Text: Yes. Various trees and hedgerows are located within the site and to its perimeter, although none are known to be protected. Mitigation / enhancement opportunities will be available and will be explored.

Council Response: TPO potential

Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1420.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Regeneration of Llanwern Steelworks for number of uses that could include: general business and industry; offices; R&amp;D, waste, energy and residential. This would be dealt with as part of the planning application process and through appropriate design. There will be clear scope to retain and enhance such features and to make general improvements to the appearance of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. This would be dealt with as part of the planning application process and through appropriate design. Significant opportunities will be presented.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:** No. Majority of the site is previously developed, although there are areas of undeveloped land within the overall site area.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Ground conditions are likely to reflect the site's use as a steel manufacturing and processing plant. Experience from adjacent major development at the St Modwen site shows that contamination of this nature can be dealt with by means of suitable remediation and mitigation.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Zone C1 flood risk area. Experience from adjacent major development proposals indicates that flood risk can be adequately dealt with by means of suitable mitigation. Recent changes to flood defences may also change the basic position at Llanwern.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site is crossed by a number of drains, ditches and reens.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:** No. Relatively flat site with no known stability issues preventing its development.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Part of the site to the south of Queen's Way falls within the Gwent Levels SSSI.

**Council Response:** cSINCs - Spencer Works 3, Elver Pill Reen and Grassland and Pond, and Greenmoor Pool. SSSI - Gwent Levels.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** No. Area is very large and significant issues are unlikely. Any localised issues within the site will be appropriately dealt with by mitigation / enhancement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.9</th>
<th>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td>Listed building n/a Ancient monuments n/a historic park n/a conservation area n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Within Newport boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.1</th>
<th>Access to Highway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Yes. Existing highways arrangement can be utilised and are capable of accommodating further development at the site. The site is used by a significant and unrestricted number of heavy goods vehicles as part of its current use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td>yes unknown. T.A required to include full promoted usage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.10</th>
<th>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Please see additional comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td>The Llanwern Ward has a shortfall in play space of 1.52Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.11</th>
<th>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Please see additional comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.2</th>
<th>Bus Route?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Redevelopment of adjacent St Modwen site will introduce a broad range of new public transport including bus services. These are expected to be developed by about the middle of the next decade and will provide a range of enhanced public transport linkages with the City Centre and surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td>800 meters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.3</th>
<th>Bus Frequency?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>See 4.2 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td>1-2 hour frequency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.4</th>
<th>Railway Station?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Regeneration of Llanwern Steelworks for number of uses that could include: general business and industry; offices; R&D, waste, energy and residential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1420.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Regeneration of Llanwern Steelworks for number of uses that could include: general business and industry; offices; R&amp;D, waste, energy and residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
- Redevelopment of adjacent St Modwen site will introduce a broad range of new public transport including a new rail halt. These are expected to be developed by the middle of the next decade and will provide enhanced linkages with the City Centre and surrounding area. The site is rail served for freight use.

**Council Response:**
- Newport station

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
- New community facilities will form a key part of the redevelopment of the adjacent St Modwen area and can also be provided at the Corus owned site.

**Council Response:**
- Newport retail park 1.4km

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**
- Employment led development will be provided as part of mixed use development that create jobs for the wider community. The site is surrounded by employment uses in its current situation.

**Council Response:**
- On site facilities & infrastructure

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:**
- Gwent Levels lie immediately to the south of the site. Substantial areas of open space are proposed nearby or could be included as part of any masterplan.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**
- Hartridge school lies to the north west of the site, with Liswerry School being located to the west of the site. Primary schools are to be provided on the adjacent Llanwern regeneration opportunity.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**
- The site is capable of accommodating a broad range of uses that would provide mixed use regeneration that would benefit the local community in terms of job creation and environmental improvement.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**
- No.
### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Site is already served by these services, with the steel processing facility having the full range of services to undertake its operations.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:** Yes. These impacts will dependant upon the mix of uses and extent of development at the site. However, the site is large enough to be able to accommodate a broad range of uses with sufficient buffer areas in place, if required.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:** The existing site has significant capacity within the existing networks, some of which Corus controls. This is likely to provide significant capacity for new uses.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

#### Sewerage

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

#### Water Supply

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelworks developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

#### Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further
Regeneration of Llanwern Steelworks for number of uses that could include: general business and industry; offices; R&D, waste, energy and residential improvements beign undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning departmment via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.  The site is large enough to be able to accommodate a broad range of uses with sufficient buffer areas in places, if required.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** The site's allocation as a strategic option would constitute an extension of the eastern expansion area as detailed in the adopted UDP. Please see additional comments in Section 8.

**Council Response:** Within the settlement boundary and the adjoining the Eastern Expansion Area.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** The site would form a logical continuation of development at the eastern expansion area. It would also reduce pressure for new development on other less sustainable sites.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** No.  Agent, acting on behalf on the owner of site.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1420.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Regeneration of Llanwern Steelworks for number of uses that could include: general business and industry; offices; R&amp;D, waste, energy and residential. The development timescales will be dependant upon the planning process and the associated local infrastructure improvements. However, it is expected that these matters can be resolved to allow new development to take place within the LDP period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site to the north of Queen’s Way lies within the defined urban boundary limit and is unallocated - i.e. white land. This area will not require any amendments. However, a small part of the site to the south perimeter will require an extension of the urban boundary limit. The area to the south is also allocated for waste disposal purposes. This allocation will need to be reviewed and a new overall mixed use regeneration allocation considered.

**Council Response:** Most southern section of the candidate site is situated outside the Eastern Expansion Area. Waste allocation WD2 would need to be deleted.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** 93/0050 PROPOSED OFFICE/LABORATORY ROOT ZONE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 19-03-1993

06/1307 RETENTION OF TWO STOREY STEEL FRAMED EXTENSION TO EXISTING ELECTRICAL CONTROL ROOM GRANTED 19-06-2008

98/0097 ERECTION OF AN AMENITIES BUILDING GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 23-03-98

96/0979 ERECTION OF 4M HIGH SINGLE STOREY WAREHOUSE ADJACENT TO EXISTING WAREHOUSE GRANTED 17-01-97

05/1133 INSTALLATION OF PORTACABIN BUILDING TO CREATE OFFICE/AMENITY SPACE GRANTED 15-09-2009

01/1066 INSTALLATION OF NEW HYDROGEN PRODUCTION PLANT GRANTED 23-11-2001

90/0783 FIVE BAY EXTENSION TO EXISTING STORAGE FACILITIES GRANTED 22-08-1990

96/0522 CONSTRUCTION OF ACID NEUTRALISATION LAGOON GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 17-07-1996
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1420.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Regeneration of Llanwern Steelworks for number of uses that could include: general business and industry; offices; R&amp;D, waste, energy and residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **02/1268** PACKAGE BOILER PLANT COMPRISING A CLADDED PORTAL FRAME BUILDING WITH ASSOCIATED CHIMNEY AND REINFORCED CONCRETE BUNDLED AREA
  - GRANTED 15-11-2002

- **09/1068** STORAGE OF LIQUID OXYGEN AND HYDROGEN
  - DECISION ISSUED 25-11-1992

- **09/0353** TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE A PROCESS PLANT TO PROVIDE FERROUS CHLORIDE SOLUTION FROM SPENT PICKLE LIQUOR
  - GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 10-06-1994

- **97/0868** CONSTRUCTION OF ACID NEUTRALISATION LAGOONS AT ZODIAC WASTE GROUND
  - GRANTED 22-10-1997

- **08/0838** INSTALLATION OF ONE LIQUID PROPANE GAS VESSEL AS STORAGE OF FUEL FOR DRYING PURPOSES
  - GRANTED 03-05-1990

- **06/1172** RETENTION OF PLANT BUILDING, STAFF BUILDING, SILOS AND HOLDING TANK
  - GRANTED 19-06-2008

- **06/1530** PROPOSED PORTAKABIN AND NEW SITE PERIMETER FENCE
  - GRANTED 04-01-2009

- **90/0595** ERECTION OF A NEW BUILDING FOR THE STORAGE OF EQUIPMENT AND PLANT SPARES
  - GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 06/07/1990

- **08/0680** EXTENSION TO EXISTING INDUSTRIAL GASES FACILITY
  - GRANTED 22-11-1989

- **90/0284** ERECTION OF A NEW BUILDING FOR THE STORAGE OF EQUIPMENT AND PLANT SPARES
  - GRANTED 19-04-1990

- **91/0816** ERECTION OF 4 BAY EXTENSION TO EXISTING STORAGE BUILDINGS
  - GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 4-12-1991
### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

#### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1420.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Regeneration of Llanwern Steelworks for number of uses that could include: general business and industry; offices; R&D, waste, energy and residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>96/1083</th>
<th>TIPPING OF RESIDUAL SLAG ON SITE TO THE SOUTH EAST OF STEELWORKS GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 23-04-1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/1231</td>
<td>RETENTION OF 6 TEMPORARY OFFICE BUILDINGS, 3 STORAGE CONTAINERS AND WC GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 17-09-2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/0854</td>
<td>CHANGE OF USE FROM STEEL COIL WAREHOUSE TO GALVANISING PRODUCTION PLANT GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 28-07-2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INSTALLATION OF AN ADDITIONAL PIPELINE FOR NITROGEN GAS SERVICE (AT QUEENSWAY, MEADOWS ROAD, NASH MEAD AND SOLUTIA) AND FOR OXYGEN GAS (AT SOLUTIA AND ALPHASTEEL) GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 10-12-2004

Relevant Planning History on adjoining sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>06/0471</th>
<th>REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO CREATE A MIXED USE URBAN EXTENSION COMPRISING: A RANGE OF NEW HOMES (APARTMENTS, HOUSES AND SOME SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION FOR THE ELDERLY - USE CLASSES C2&amp;C3); NEW OFFICES, WORKSHOPS, FACTORIES AND WAREHOUSES (USE CLASSES B1, B2&amp;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEAD OF ENGINEERING &amp; CONSTRUCTION: THE APPLICANT IS COMMITTED TO PROVIDING AN EASTERN LINK TO THE SDR AND NORTH SOUTH LINK OVER THE RAILWAY - Access to the residential part of the development should not rely on a single access road. This has been addressed with additional access on the amended indicative masterplan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction

1.1 This statement has been prepared in response to the Council’s call for candidate sites and accompanies the duly completed Candidate Sites Form (above).

2.0 Site Location, Extent and Current Land Use

2.1 The site comprises what is known locally as “New Llanwern” where steel products brought in from other plants are finished and processed. The operational area is located to the north of the Queen’s Way, which is currently a private road. There is also a waste management site located to the east of the operational area, along with a number of lagoons associated with Corus’ production at the site. Further to the east, the site is bordered by Gwent Europark which lies outside of the site boundary. The northern boundary of the site is formed by the main intercity railway line which connects South Wales to London.

2.2 A large part of the site also extends to the south of Queen’s Way. The majority of this land is allocated within the adopted UDP as the Steelworks Waste Site (Greenmoor). This land is allocated for the tipping and storage of steelwork waste. The waste facility is a licensed and operational facility. A number of independent firms are also located to the south of Queen’s Way within the waste allocation area which, or have been, linked to Corus’ activities at Llanwern. Further to west of the waste facility are the Reedbed system, together with land that forms the eastern perimeter of the Caldicot Levels.

2.3 In total the site extends to approximately 580 hectares.

3.0 Future Land Use(s)

3.1 As previously submitted as part of the major candidate sites process, the site offers significant potential to accommodate a broad range of land uses over the LDP period. At its most substantial, the Corus land offers significant potential for major mixed use redevelopment at a new gateway to Newport and South east Wales. The previous submission made at the Major Candidate Site stage detailed how there will potentially be opportunities for new, improved and replacement facilities associated with ‘New Llanwern’ and also for some independent uses to the north of Queen’s Way. We also set out the ability of the southern area to accommodate a full mixture of uses and activities.

3.2 As also set out at the Major Candidate Site stage, the future redevelopment of the site will be influenced by a number of significant changes that either have, or are, planned to take place at Llanwern over the next 20 years, including the following:

- To the west, St Modwen has secured a resolution to grant outline planning permission for a major new community on the site of the former “heavy end” of the steelworks. A total of 4,000 new homes is proposed in a transformed landscape, together with a new local centre, and a new business park.
- The proposals will also significantly alter the accessibility of the area. The Queen’s Way will become a public highway connecting the southern distributor road (at the retail park) to junction 23 of the M4. In addition, a new rail halt is proposed (at the junction of St Modwen’s site and New Llanwern), together with provision for a 1,000 space park and ride facility.
- Added to these changes, is the prospect of the new M4, which will travel along the southern boundary of Corus’ land (on an alignment to be confirmed).

3.3 We contend that the unique circumstances of the site should be recognised by means of a strategic approach to the future development opportunity presented by the Corus land. Such an approach would recognise and support what is already located at the site, whilst identifying and encouraging new projects to be captured or attracted to the site.

3.4 In light of the above, we would suggest that the Corus land at Llanwern is recognised as a strategic regeneration allocation, where the following uses could be accommodated as part of a major mixed use area:

- General business and industry, either building on existing facilities or independently;
- Offices, research and development facilities;
- New roads and infrastructure;
- Civic and institutional uses;
- Other mixed/commercial uses;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1420.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Regeneration of Llanwern Steelworks for number of uses that could include: general business and industry; offices; R&amp;D, waste, energy and residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hotels and roadside uses;
- Waste recycling, energy and waste to energy facilities;
- Residential development (including elderly and student accommodation).

4.0 Site Suitability and Strategy that Development would Support

4.1 The majority of the site represents previously developed (brownfield) land in an established and significant urban area. This is especially true of the land to the north of Queen’s Way and of the land to the south west of the site.

4.2 A mixed use, masterplan led allocation of the Corus land would significantly help to improve the performance of any Local Development Plan. It would reduce the need for large Greenfield land releases and would increase the proportion of development that can be accommodated on previously developed land in an inherently urban and sustainable location. Indeed, the site’s location adjacent to the approved Llanwern steelworks major residential scheme illustrates the importance of this area in terms of the ongoing development of Newport.

4.3 The site also has a unique element to it, due to its ability to provide linkages with the St Modwen redevelopment area that is located immediately to the west. The Corus land therefore has the ability to provide an extension of UDP eastern expansion area without the need for further Greenfield land release.

4.4 A resolution to grant planning permission has been made for the St Modwen development, which envisages a residential led mixed use redevelopment of some 4,000 houses. This development will transform the area and bring about large scale infrastructure improvements to the surrounding area. New community facilities, roads and rail links will be developed creating a sustainable community on the doorstep of the Corus land.

4.5 Identifying the Corus land as a strategic opportunity area will trigger a continuation of this growth strategy for east Newport. Making provision for mixed use redevelopment would be consistent with National Planning Policy Guidance and the preference for previously developed land, as detailed in Paragraph 2.7 of Planning Policy Wales.

This clearly states:

If the Assembly Government’s objectives for the more sustainable use of land and buildings and the re-use of previously developed sites are to be achieved, local authorities should work with landowners to ensure that suitable sites are brought forward for development and to secure a coherent approach to renewal.

4.6 It is acknowledged that there will be ground condition issues to overcome, given the site’s historic use as a steel manufacturing area (and associated waste facilities).

Furthermore, it is understood that the area is located within Zone C1 according to the TAN 15 DAM’s. However, experience from the adjacent St Modwen site illustrates that both these constraints can be overcome in order to allow for redevelopment of the Corus land.

4.7 Similarly, it is considered that issues of nature conservation and environmental considerations can be fully addressed as part of any future development of the site. The site offers the opportunity to improve the ground conditions of this area, which would have positive benefits in terms of habitat protection and enhancement.

4.8 Clearly, in light of the above, the site represents an inherently suitable and acceptable brownfield opportunity within the urban area that should be included within the emerging LDP as a strategic regeneration opportunity.
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1425.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential property on land west of 'Jessmond', South Row, Redwick.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 90/ South Row Redwick

**Question**: Representation Texts

#### SA Recommendation

- Within SSSI, close to SPA, RAMSAR; Gwent Levels (Redwick/Magor/Undy: Redwick/Magwyr/Gwndy character area “Irregular field pattern of small fields (includes some regular areas), drainage features (reens, surface drainage) include major medieval reens, seawall includes relict sea wall (SAM)”: development unlikely to have direct effect in itself but any potential cumulative effects to be mitigated through LDP policies.
- Flood Zone C1: mitigation should be included where possible. Bungalow style dwelling may not be appropriate as ground floor sleeping accommodation increases the risk from flooding.
- The design of any development must take into account the environmental and historical designations of the site, ensuring no negative effects occur.
- The sewerage infrastructure of the site should ensure that the potential for pollution to water resources is minimised.

**Question**: Overall Council Response

- The site is divorced from the settlement of Redwick and located in the open countryside. It is also an area of high landscape value on the Caldicot levels. It should not be included within the settlement boundary or allocated for residential purposes.

- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

- The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

- It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

- **Representation Text**: ST No: 05.4184
- **NG No**: 8241

**Question: 2.2 Location**

- **Representation Text**: West of residential property 'Jessmond' south Row, Redwick.

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

- **Representation Text**: CYM225304 ST4184 NGPT 8241
  WA604612 DTD 17-05-2005

- **Council Response**: 341829 184406
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<tr>
<td>1425.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed residential property on land west of 'Jessmond', South Row, Redwick.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
- **Representation Text**: 0.675ha
- **Council Response**: 0.49ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- **Representation Text**: The surface features of the land is flat and surrounded by hedges.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text**: Grazing.

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text**: To build one residence.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text**: No. Greenfield land for grazing animals.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text**: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text**: Yes. Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. This site has been previously surveyed (003-1978 Caldicott and Wentloog Levels). This found subgrade 3a. There is a low probability of their being BMV at this site.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text**: If only one residential propety was built in line, and near to the boundary of Jessmond. Very little visible from South Road would be seen.
- **Council Response**: Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Area within proposed SLA 5 Caldicot Level. Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text**: Yes. There are mature trees in the hedge adjacent to the pet crematorium located at Green St Farm, Redwick.
- **Council Response**: SSSI and TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td>1425.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If planning was given for the erection of one dwelling, then I believe this should enhance the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.16 Archaeology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Greenfield?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. The land appears to have been in long term agricultural use, and are not aware of any environmental or land contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Flood Risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Situated within Zone C1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. The land is flat and naturally any building would have to have a raft foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 SSSI?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. The land lies within the Caldicot and Wentloog Levels, and within the Redwick site of Special Scientific Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within the Gwent Levels - Redwick and Linadevenny SSSI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 Protected Species?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proposed residential property on land west of ‘Jessmond’, South Row, Redwick.**

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
Representation Text: Yes. The highway is more than capable of supporting traffic generated by the proposed development.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
Council Response: The Llanwern Ward has a shortfall in play space of 1.52Ha. Owing to the small size of the site an off-site contribution for the refurbishment of play facilities locally would be required.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
Representation Text: Because of the bus services and my age, I could use this service and improve public transport.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
Representation Text: 100 yards.
Council Response: adjacent site

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
Representation Text: One hour timetables to Magor and Newport.
Council Response: 1-2 hour frequency

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
Representation Text: 3 1/2 miles to Severn Tunnel.
Council Response: Newport station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
Representation Text: Caldicot town approx 4 miles
- Magor 2 1/2 miles
- Newport 8 miles.
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</table>

**Council Response:** magor square 4km

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
- To Llanwern Steelworks 2 miles.
- New Industrial Park 2 miles.
- Magor Brewery 2 1/2 miles
- Caldicot 4 miles
- Newport 8 miles

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- Redwick is known for its walking and cycling clubs etc.
- National cycle route runs alongside the site's southern boundary.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- There are many open spaces in this area.
- Redwick playground.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- Local people have had planning permission and built property in the last few years.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- Water, electricity, and telecommunication are available in the road adjoining. Sewerage would be septic tank. No gas is available to Redwick.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
Summary: Proposed residential property on land west of ‘Jessmond’, South Row, Redwick.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelwork’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the
### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representation Text:**

> No.

---

### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representation Text:**

> To use small parcels of land should enhance Redwick Village.

**Council Response:**

> Divorced from the Redwick village boundary.

---

### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

**Representation Text:**

> See 6.5

---

### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representation Text:**

> Yes. My ex wife has an interest and she has been notified and submitted her own submission.

---

### Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

**Representation Text:**

> Yes.

---

### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

**Representation Text:**

> No.

---

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

**Representation Text:**

> Yes. My ex wife has a right of way across the front boundary to get into her ground.

---

### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?

**Representation Text:**

> Yes. I hope so, as I have owned this ground for twenty years, and would like to think I could build a bungalow before I retire 4-6 years.

---

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:**

> Yes. Requires changes to Redwick Village boundary and the Countryside designation.

---

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

---
### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 8 Other Information?
**Representation Text:** I have owned this site since 1991, and originally bought it for hoping to develop and build one property on it, a bungalow for my retirement. The boundary of the village of Redwick should be extended to at least Jessmond to the West of Redwick, and Green Street Farm, Redwick to the north of Redwick. It makes no sense to me, as there are small parcel of land in Redwick, that should be infilled for good quality building, and this would have implications on local services which are very little at present, with no shop, but still retains a public house under threat for lack of customers, also visitors from the Newport and District areas such as running clubs and cyclists and cyclists club should be welcome to support local interests in Redwick Village.

### Question: 9 Map Included?
**Representation Text:** Yes.
Question: SA Recommendation
Council Response:
It should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted.
The area of woodland TPO (mixed deciduous) should be retained and linkages to the wider ecological system maintained.
It is recommended that development leads to the enhancement of green infrastructure, and as such, this should be designed into the allocation.
Any potential contamination on the previously developed portion of the site should be investigated and remediated where necessary ahead of development.
If development is to proceed it should be proved ahead of development that no negative effects on the watercourse will arise as a result.
Site is sensitive development in a known flood risk area. Subject to the revisions to TAN 15, it should be ensured that development will not increase the risk of flooding to people or property subject to advice from the EA.
Site contains a listed building: it is recommended that the setting and value of the listed building are enhanced through the development of the site.

Question: Overall Council Response
Council Response:
Agree to remove the candidate site from the Environmental Space allocation. Development Advice Map from TAN 15 indicates that the site is within Zone C2. Allocation of this site for residential use would therefore be contrary to national policy. It is recommended that this site is not allocated for residential purposes in the Local Development Plan.

Question: 2.1 Site Name
Representation Text: Bassaleg Ambulance Station

Question: 2.2 Location
Representation Text: The site is located off Park View, Bassaleg

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
Representation Text: 32801 18701
Council Response: 328013 181043

Question: 2.4 Site Area
Representation Text: 0.122
Council Response: 0.13ha

Question: 2.5 Brief Description
Representation Text: The site is flat and developed and enclosed. It adjoins Whiteheads Rigby Club and the former Tredegar Golf Course. The Ebbw River lies to the south west of the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1445.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Bassaleg Ambulance Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

- **Representation Text:** Ambulance station.

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

- **Representation Text:** Residential development.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Ambulance station is the existing use.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representation Text:**

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representation Text:** The site lies within the urban area of Newport. Park View and Forge Lane are well used highways. The site lies within a predominantly residential area and, therefore, the proposed use would be in keeping with the area. The site is small and not particularly prominent and redevelopment could enhance its appearance.

- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: No strategic issues however detailed considerations to be agreed for landscape enhancement.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

- **Representation Text:** No. The site is enclosed by vegetation, none of which is protected.

- **Council Response:** Screening trees.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

- **Representation Text:** Redevelopment of the site would create a more attractive building(s) and would not result in adverse visual impact.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

- **Representation Text:** No. The site is already developed and is in private ownership.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

- **Representation Text:** No. There are no scheduled ancient monuments or listed buildings on or in the close vicinity of the site.

- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Greenfield?</td>
<td>1445.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Bassaleg Ambulance Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: No. The site satisfies the definition of previously developed land contained in Figure 2.1 of Planning Policy Wales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Flood Risk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. It is possible that the site is contaminated as a result of use by vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. River Ebbw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: No. The site is flat and capable of redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>SSSI?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. The site is not subject to any statutory designations. At a local level the site forms part of an extensive area that is designated as Environmental Space in the adopted UDP. The reasons for this are unclear as the site is developed and makes no contribution to the Environmental Space designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Protected Species?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: . It is not known whether the site contains any protected species but, as with any developed site with buildings, he presence of bats, for example, cannot be ruled out. The presence of any protected species on a site such as this would not preclude redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Access to Highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. The site has an existing access from Park View, an adopted highway. A short distance to the west, Park View connects with the A467 and A468, which offers easy, principal route connections to the north, west and south. M4 junction 28 is located only a mile to the south, giving excellent regional and national access. The site is small and an existing traffic generator. Redevelopment would generate low traffic levels which, in relation to existing flows on the local highway network would be insignificant. Council Response: yes. Park view yes comparably less traffic than existing ambulance use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: . Redevelopment of the site could incorporate a link to the UDP designated long distance walk/cycleway on its eastern boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Bassaleg Ambulance Station

The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. The site access is currently a common entrance with that of Whiteheads Sport & Social club that has some key local outdoor facilities. Any residential development must be mindful of the sporting and recreational facilities that are currently on site and that might be provided in the future. Issues relating to noise nuisance should be addressed at the planning stage to prevent ongoing issues for future residents and the clubs management committee. Owing to the small size of the site an off-site contribution for the refurbishment of play facilities locally would be required.

Council Response:

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
Representation Text: There are existing bus stops on Park View within easy walking distance. Redevelopment of the site would help support local bus services.

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
Representation Text: There are two bus stops on Park View, very close to the site: Pye Corner North East and Pye Corner South West.
Council Response: Park view adjacent to site.

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
Representation Text: The two main services are: service X16 (Cardiff, Risca, Newbridge and Abertillery) which runs every two hours; and service 50 (Bargoed, Caerphilly, machen, Newport City Centre) which runs every 30 minutes.
Council Response: 30 min frequency

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
Representation Text: Newport train station is approximately 3 miles.
Council Response: Newport

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
Representation Text: There is a Post Office to the west of the site on Caerphilly Road (approximately 1 mile), and a Spar to the east of the site on Bassaleg Road (approximately 1.5 miles).
Council Response: Laurel rd shops 650-1km (via bridge)
Green meadow rd 800m

Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
Representation Text: The site is strategically located for access to regional employment opportunities. Primary and secondary schools, a public house, Post Office, dentists, doctors, pharmacy, restaurant, petrol station and two convenience stores are all close by. Cardiff Road Retail Park and Newport City Centre are within east reach.

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
Representation Text: There is a UDP designated long distance walk/cycle way adjacent to the site and the Sirhowy Valley Walk is close by, giving easy access for informal recreation and exercise.
Council Response: National cycle route runs alongside the site.
Links to existing infrastructure.

Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1445.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development on Bassaleg Ambulance Station

**Representation Text:**

Yes. There are no public rights of way on the site itself.

There is a UDP designated long distance walk/cycleway adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.9 Open Space?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.1 Schools?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

**Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we**

16/02/2012
### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representation Text:**

**No.**

---

### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representation Text:**

The site is located within the urban area, with easy access to public transport services and an extensive range of community, employment and retail facilities. The predominant land use is residential.

**Council Response:**

Within settlement boundary.

---

### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

**Representation Text:**

There is very little opportunity for adjoining land to be redeveloped. Adjoining land is protected as Environmental Space.

---

### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representation Text:**

Yes. The site is wholly owned by the Welsh Ambulance Services NHS Trust.

---

### Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

**Representation Text:**

No. Agent acting on behalf of the owner.

---

### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

**Representation Text:**

No.

---

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

**Representation Text:**

Yes. The site is currently in operational use as an ambulance station. The NHS Trust is reviewing its operational requirements on an all-Wales basis. Until the review is complete, it is not possible to say whether this site will be declared surplus to operational requirements and, if so, at what date. The candidate site submission is being made in case the site does become available for redevelopment.

---

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

---

---

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development on Bassaleg Ambulance Station may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site useage.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1445.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Bassaleg Ambulance Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The boundary of the UDP designated Environmental Space would need to be amended to exclude the site.

This should be done anyway as the site does not contribute to the Environmental Space. This small adjustment would not materially affect the size of the Environmental Space and, as the site is already developed, it would have no effect on the purpose for which the Environmental Space was designated.

**Council Response:**
Exclusion of the candidate site from the Environmental Space designation.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
00/0980 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE) AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATH 393/121 & 393/119
REFUSED 06-Dec-2000
None significant

09/0097 CREATION OF NEW JUNCTION FOR VEHICULAR ACCESS IN RELATION TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED RESIDENTIAL SCHEME
No decision

03/1763 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, FLOOD ALLEVIATION WORKS AND ASSOCIATED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY 393/120 AND 393/121 (REVISED ACCESS DETAILS) (OUTLINE)
Dismissed at appeal, allowed by Secretary of State

02/0140 FLOOD ALLEVIATION WORKS AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATH NO. 393/121
Refused 29-May-2003
EA: Object to the proposed development on the grounds that it is unlikely that formal consent of the Agency in accordance with the requirements of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the water Resources Act 1991 will be given for the works as they are contrary to the Agency's "Policy and Practice for the Protection of Floodplains".
HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES: Further surveys need to be undertaken, particularly with regard to Great Crested Newt, together with a comprehensive survey of dragonflies/damselflies. A full botanical survey would be beneficial, as well as a survey of other invertebrates and winter migrating birds.
CAMPAIGN FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL WALES: Object to the proposal on the grounds that there is insufficient detail concerning the effects of diverting flood water; the proposal is likely to be detrimental to local flora and fauna due to disturbance during construction and long term habitat changes; the need for flood alleviation does not seem to have been qualified; it seems this development is a precursor to residential development.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.
## Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

Directly adjacent to SSSI. The comprehensive redevelopment of the site will enable the development of an extensive green infrastructure network to enhance the biodiversity potential of the site. This could also incorporate SUDS to minimise the risk of flooding, as well as walking and cycling routes, within the site and connecting to the wider area, to encourage a modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport.

- Development on the site could potentially include some tourist facilities, to capitalise on any archaeological assets, as the site is within the ASA.
- It should be ensured that the proposed improvements to public transport are realised and will accommodate all access to, from and within the site. It is recommended that the site is not "self contained" as this infers that it will not integrate with or benefit the existing community especially the community of Ringland, which suffers deprivation levels. It should be ensured that connectivity to surrounding areas is enhanced to enable the full integration of the new development within the community to reduce inequalities.
- The full range of community facilities (Table 7.1) should be provided within development.

## Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

This site is the largest part of the adopted UDP’s Eastern expansion Area, and now has planning consent. The allocation will be taken forward into the LDP as a major regeneration initiative, providing a sustainable extension to the urban area.

## Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Llanwern Regeneration Site/Glan Lyn

## Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Land situated to the north of the Queen’s Way, Llanwern, Newport.

## Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>336067</td>
<td>186853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

E: 336067 N: 186853

## Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** Approximately 250 hectares.

**Council Response:** 251.4ha

## Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** Rectangular site, broadly flat and bordered by the mainline railway, Newport Retail Park, the Corus complex and the Private Road (Queen’s Way) that serves it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Cleared site awaiting (ongoing) remediation and redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2.7</th>
<th>Proposed Use(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Mixed use urban extension including 4000+ new homes, public open space, a district centre, new schools and a new business park, together with new infrastructure, groundworks, landscaping ancillary works and activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Brownfield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Former &quot;Heavy End&quot; of Llanwern Steelworks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.10</th>
<th>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.11</th>
<th>Agricultural Land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.12</th>
<th>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>A comprehensive assessment of visual impact and landscape quality has been carried out for the redevelopment of the site. This has confirmed that new development can be successfully accommodated and integrated within the landscape. Substantial improvements are likely given the current condition and appearance of the site. This has been accepted by the Council and the CCW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Countryside comments: Site has potential for landscape improvement with Public Open Space benefit. Visual impact and tree issues to be considered at design stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.13</th>
<th>Trees and Hedgerows?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Small groups of existing trees are found at the south eastern corner of the site. These are not statutorily protected but most will be retained as part of the new development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.14</th>
<th>Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Comprehensive redevelopment of the site offers the clear and acknowledged potential to improve both the appearance of the site and to increase the amount and quality of habitats for protected and non-protected species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.15</th>
<th>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the site will involve the creation of a significant network of corridors and green spaces. These will include channels and lakes and public routes as well as those reserved for wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.16</th>
<th>Archaeology?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/02/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Poly</td>
<td>AccessNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

No. Archaeological potential has been considered and addressed to the satisfaction of GGAT.

**Council Response:**

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Former Steelworks Restraint. Archaeological assessment produced. Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. No reason for not allocating in LDP

---

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

Representation Text: Yes. As a redundant steelworks parts of the site are affected by significant ground condition issues. Solutions to these conditions have been designed, tested and accepted by the Environment Agency and the Council.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

Representation Text: As shown on the Development Advice Maps, the site falls within Zone C1 (like much of Newport). A flood risk strategy has been devised, tested and accepted by the Environment Agency and the Council. In addition recent improvements to the defence on the east bank of the Usk are likely to reduce flood risk significantly.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: cSINC - Monk’s Ditch Adjoins the Gwent Levels SSSI.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

Representation Text: Yes. Substantial and ongoing survey work across the site shows that protected species are found in a very small part of the LRS only. Effective protection and mitigation strategies have been devised for these species and agreed with the Council.

Council Response: There are species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Listed building n/a
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**Summary:** Mixed use urban extension including 4000+ new homes, public open space, district centre, new schools and business park.

- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Modest improvements are necessary to upgrade the Queen’s Way to the public highway. These measures and a series of improvements to the wider road network that will allow it to accommodate the proposed development have been considered and approved by the Council.

**Council Response:**
- yes
- yes-outline planning approved

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
The open space on the site will be public and will be accessible to all.

**Council Response:**
A range of community, outdoor sport and recreation facilities have been agreed for the benefits of the local community on this site.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
All the new residents will have access to the new bus services, and all will be closed to the proposed rail halt when it is installed.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
Existing bus services run to the adjacent retail park. New services are proposed to run through the new neighbourhood.

**Council Response:**
To be provided as part of S 106 agreement

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
Frequency to be determined.

**Council Response:**
Proposed on site situation

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
A new rail halt is proposed as part of the regeneration scheme. The council expects this to come forward by the middle of the next decade.

**Council Response:**
Proposed on site station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
The existing retail park joins the western edge of the site. A new district centre forms part of the proposed redevelopment of the site.

**Council Response:**
District centre proposed for site
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**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
- The proposed new housing sits next to a full range of job opportunities – from the retail park and Queensway Meadow areas to the west to Corus’ New Llanwern to the east. A significant new business park is also included within the mix of uses on the site.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**
- The development concept adopted for the site is designed to make it as self-contained as possible (whilst encouraging linkage to the city Centre). Walking and cycling networks are central to the movement strategy proposed.

**Council Response:**
- on site provision & infrastructure

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:**
- The site is currently private (to reflect past use). New links are proposed as part of the development to connect the site to the surrounding area (and vice versa)

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:**
- Substantial areas of new open space will be provided on the site.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. Two new primary schools are proposed on the site. The new development will be served by Hartridge (adjacent and Lliswerry High Schools

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. Strong support for the scheme has been expressed by the local community.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**
- Substantial new opportunities will be created to live, work and play on the site. A very large number of jobs will be created during the construction stage.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**
- No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:**
- Present on site.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:**
- No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**
- Regeneration of the site will mainly use existing infrastructure which will be improved or upgraded to accommodate the development proposed. Options for on site provision are also
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Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
1466.C1 05/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Mixed use urban extension including 4000+ new homes, public open space, district centre, new schools and business park.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelwork’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.
### Mixed use urban extension

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. New housing on the eastern boundary will be separated from the retained Corus facility by the new business park and open space.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. The Llanwern Regeneration Site is a prime example of a mixed use urban extension. Its western edge joins the existing urban area.
- **Council Response:** Within allocated Eastern Expansion Area.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Regeneration of the site would accommodate a substantial amount of new development in an inherently sustainable location. This would reduce pressure on the surrounding area and especially on nearby greenfield land.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Development will commence before the LDP period begins and is likely to continue for the duration of the LDP.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- 95/0132 ERECTION OF NEW PROCESSING PLANT TO RECOVER SULPHURIC ACID GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 05-May-1995
- 95/0017 ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE NEW CONTROL ROOM LABORATORY OFFICES AND ANCILLARY FLOORSpace
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GRANTED 31-Mar-1995

93/1152 INSTALLATION OF EFFLUENT BUFFER STORAGE PLANT
GRANTED 21-Jan-1994

93/1019 ERECTION OF STEEL STORAGE TANK FOR EFFLUENT BUFFER STORAGE (BITMAC)
APPLICATION REQUIRED 12-Nov-1993

98/0343 ERECTION OF A 50M HIGH SILO COMPRESSOR HOUSE SWITCH ROOM AND ASSOCIATED PIPEWORK AND WALKWAYS FOR COAL INJECTION TO NO. 3 BLAST FURNACE
GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 02-Jul-1998

04/1573 INSTALLATION OF AN ADDITIONAL PIPELINE FOR NITROGEN GAS SERVICE (AT QUEENSWAY, MEADOWS ROAD, NASH MEAD AND SOLUTIA) AND FOR OXYGEN GAS (AT SOLUTIA AND ALPHASTEEL)
GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 10-Dec-2004

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text: 1. St. Modwen Developments Limited (SMDL) is promoting the comprehensive regeneration of the former heavy end of the Llanwern Steelworks. The Council will be familiar with the proposals which are part of an agreed long term development strategy to grow the City, and to use the old Steelworks as the platform for this growth. The regeneration of the site forms a key part of the Unitary Development Plan and SMDL is currently working with the Council to complete a legal (section 106) agreement that will release outline planning permission for a 4,000 home urban extension on the site. The first houses on the site should be delivered next year.

2. SMDL's proposals have the full support of the Council, Newport Unlimited and national planning policy. They will include a mixture of housing together with substantial new areas of public open space, a district centre and a business park offering over 1 million square feet of new workspace, offices and warehouses.

3. The comprehensive and lasting regeneration of the site is likely to take some time – with a development programme of about 20 years necessary to complete the project. This was recognised by the Council in resolving to grant planning permission for the scheme which at approximately 600 acres of previously developed land is one of the largest single regeneration projects in the UK.

4. Despite the position that has been reached with the proposals, it is important that local planning policy continues to support the redevelopment of the Llanwern Regeneration Site – and to prioritise the delivery of new homes and business space there. There are two dimensions to this – the first is to ensure that the site features at the heart of the overall vision for the plan and the second is to place at the top of a carefully compiled list of phased development opportunities that will allow the City to grow in a managed and sustainable way.
5. It is in this context that the SMDL has completed responses to the Strategic Options and Call for Candidate Site Questionnaires.

6. The information contained on this (candidate site) form can be corroborated by a suite of investigations about the site and the proposals that have been made in response to the conditions and opportunities presented. Many of these were prepared for or submitted with the outline planning application for the site or have been prepared subsequently as part of ongoing investigations and updates. It is important to note that there are no outstanding issues associated with the redevelopment of the site from the Council or any other consultees.

7. SMDL is committed to delivering the regeneration of the site over the remaining years of the Unitary Development Plan and the LDP’s plan period. Recent experience demonstrates that the development industry – and housebuilders in particular remains equally committed to commence development quickly despite current market conditions. This commitment and ability to react positively to challenging market conditions is a key advantage of the Llanwern scheme and its stewardship by SMDL. It will lead to the first homes being delivered next year.

8. For all these reasons, the Llanwern Site should remain as a key allocation for mixed use, housing led regeneration in the LDP. Given its importance the project should be granted the highest priority in the LDP and resources should be dedicated to bringing it forward and accelerating anticipated development timescales. In the first instance this should be done, where appropriate by delaying or phasing the submission and approval of greenfield and/or less sustainable schemes until later in the plan period.

Question: 9  Map Included?

Representation Text: Yes.
### Question: SA Recommendation

- The proportion of housing to open space should seek to ensure the retention of local character and ecological value. This is especially the case for site 1341.C1 which includes a cSINC designation - it is recommended that the cSINC is retained as open space, and a buffer is created between development and the cSINC, as well as between development and the SSSI to the north.
- PROWs, TPOs and protected hedgerows should be enhanced throughout the sites.
- The provision of housing should include a convenience store on at least one of the sites.
- It is recommended that walking and cycling routes to key services and facilities including employment are enhanced as part of development proposals. Enhanced bus provision should also be considered to reduce the potential effect of traffic growth.

### Question: Overall Council Response

This land directly abuts the south east corner of the Langstone village boundary. The nursery at the site is now closed. The land in question is not considered to be of the same urban character as the land and houses to the north.

The area is constrained by low sewerage capacity and high landscape value.

As to whether this land is needed for the Newport housing supply the Council would contend that it is not.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

### Question: Site Name

Representation Text: 
- Land west of Parc Seymour.

### Question: Location

Representation Text: 
- Land est of Parc Seymour.

### Question: Grid Reference

- ST 405 915
- Council Response: 340552 191854

### Question: Site Area

- 16/02/2012
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**Summary:** Proposed residential development with open space on land West of Parc Seymour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Current Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Proposed Use(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Brownfield?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Agricultural Land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Trees and Hedgerows?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.5**

**Representation Text:**

Land for village expansion up to defensible boundaries to the west.

**Council Response:**

Land for village expansion up to defensible boundaries to the west.

**Question: 2.6**

**Representation Text:**

Unused.

**Question: 2.7**

**Representation Text:**

Housing with public open space.

**Question: 3.1**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. ALC not known.

**Question: 3.10**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 3.11**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 3.12**

**Representation Text:**

Area of land containing modest sized fields contained within strong existing physical features of roads and watercourse. Generally low lying in the wider landscape but ROW crossing the site conveys a moderate visual interest.

**Council Response:**


**Question: 3.13**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Protected under the Hedgerow Regulations.

**Council Response:**

TPOs ref: 03/97 - area of alder, ash, hawthorne, hazel, holly, oak and willow. TPO 3/1997 and additional TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14**

**Representation Text:**

Could safeguard boundary hedgerows and strengthen riparian corridor.

**Question: 3.15**

16/02/2012
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**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In part of a medieval hunting park. Green Meadow is a post-medieval farm and may have a medieval precursor. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary
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| 1468.C1                                       | 06/05/2009        | E       | P | W | M                              | Summary: Proposed residential development with open space on land West of Parc Seymour. |

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Points of access off Parc Seymour Road.

**Council Response:**
Yes
no existing lane narrow with poor access onto parc seymour and chepstow road.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
By providing additional public open space.

**Council Response:**
The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. The proposed development is approximately 600m from the nearest play facilities. A LEAP and LAP(s) provision would be required on site to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, with off-site contributions for formal play locally.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
By a position close to existing bus services.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
<250m

**Council Response:**
250 metres to closest part of site

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
Hourly.

**Council Response:**
30 min -1hour service.

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
3 miles

**Council Response:**
newport station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
1 shop available within 250m.

**Council Response:**
200metres
parc seymour store

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
<3km magor and Eastern Expansion Area.<5km Newport Retail Park.
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**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:** It is sited within cycling distance of essential services and walking encouraged in layout.

**Council Response:** on site provision and infrastructure

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** 402/14 16

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:** Within 50m.

**Council Response:** Rockfield Playground and Rockfield Glade, Parc Seymour.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Public House <100m

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:** By increasing housing choices at places where people wish to live.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:** Adjacent.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** Welsh Water Comments

**Council Response:** Sewerage
Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments seek to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: By extending the settlement to defensible limits using existing landscape features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1468.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development with open space on land West of Parc Seymour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

*Representation Text:* It would remove pressure for more incongruous urban expansions into the countryside at other locations.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Changes?**

*Council Response:* Requires an extension of the settlement boundary and deletion of countryside designation.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

*Council Response:* CONVERSION OF DAIRY OUTBUILDING INTO RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION (RESUBMISSION OF REFUSAL 91/0912/F) 12th feb 93 In Basement

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

*Representation Text:* In considering the allocation of sites to meet the LDP housing requirement it will be important to ensure that there is a wide range and choice of sites for housing which are deliverable throughout Newport. Whilst the main emphasis of such a strategy will still be a concentration on the development of brownfield land, in order to achieve the levels of growth anticipated there will be a requirement for the release of greenfield sites. It is evident that the sites allocated in the UDP to meet the Growth Strategy have failed to deliver. As an example it was assumed in the UDP that the Eastern Expansion Area would provide 1700 dwellings in the plan period yet to date no completions have occurred and it is doubtful whether there will be any at all by 2011. The LDP should avoid relying on too few large sites to deliver the Growth Strategy. The LDP should look to allocate a wide range of sites in sustainable locations throughout Newport.

The allocation of the land to the west of Parc Seymour (as shown on the attached plan) would provide a sustainable settlement extension on a site which is viable and deliverable within the LDP period. The site area is approximately 8 hectares and it could accommodate in the order of 150 new dwellings including a substantial element of affordable housing on a net development area of approximately 5 hectares. It would make a valuable contribution to meeting the housing requirement, including the provision of affordable housing, and would also help achieve the LDP’s Growth Strategy.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.
### Overall Council Response

The site is a Greenfield site located adjacent to the urban area of Caerleon, designated as Green Wedge and Countryside. The land has also been identified as an area of moderate to high value by the LANDMAP data source supplied by CCW. There are a number of Tree Preservation Orders on the site. The site is adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Access to the site is considered to be ???

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.

Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8

It is recommended that the site is allocated as Green Wedge and Countryside and that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation.

### Question: Site Name

**Representation Text:**

- Land adjacent to 7 Parkwood Close, Caerleon

### Question: Location

**Representation Text:**

- NP18 3SX
Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Parkwood Close, Caerleon

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

Representation Text: ST 320 910

Council Response: 332083 191103

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

Representation Text: 1.132 ha

Council Response: 1.29ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

Representation Text: South facing slope between existing residential development at Parkwood Close and Lodge Wood.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

Representation Text: Vacant pasture

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text: Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. Not BMV. Land limited to subgrade 3b on slope.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Representation Text: It is an elevated site with extensive views but visual aspects have been compromised by the presence of two telecommunications masts on adjacent land.

Council Response: Countryside comments: Incursion into open countryside. Area has Moderate to High LandMAP values. Potential visual impacts

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

Representation Text: Semi-mature trees close to site boundary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>Accessn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>Accessn No</td>
<td>Date Lodged</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status Modified</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501.C1</td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Parkwood Close, Caerleon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention of open space in part of the site to form a public viewpoint.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.16 Archaeology? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Adjacent to the Lodge Hill Iron Age Hillfort (Scheduled Ancient Monument) but at lower level. Fairly Significant Restraint. Impact on setting of Scheduled Ancient Monument. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.2 Greenfield? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.4 Flood Risk? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.7 SSSI? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.8 Protected Species? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Lodge Wood to the north is likely to form a habitat for bats etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building? Representation Text:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501.C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Council Response:**

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

Representation Text: No. new access required via garden area of Parkwood House would form an extension of Parkwood House to serve development (land required in control of client).

Council Response: No access to the site is not achievable width or gradient on the land unavailable.

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

Representation Text: Potential links to Lodge Wood and new open space area on site.

Council Response: The proposed development falls within the Caerleon Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 3.64Ha. The nearest play facility is approximately 750m away. The topography of the site is not conducive to the onsite provision of play therefore an off-site contribution for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

 Representation Text: Bus routes already accessible at short distance from site.

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

Representation Text: 100 metres, along Trinity View

Council Response: 700 metres

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

Representation Text: Half hourly

Council Response: 10-20 min frequency

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

Representation Text: Newport Station - 4 kilometres (proposed new station at Caerleon - 850 metres)

Council Response: newport station 5 miles

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

Representation Text: Post Office/store at Roman Way, approx 800 metres.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1501.C1</td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development on Parkwood Close, Caerleon

---

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:** Within 1.5km radius range of facilities in Caerleon including school, university, Western Industrial Estate.

---

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:** Presence of new route along Pillmawr Road

**Council Response:** on site provision. Steep site does not promote cycling

---

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:** Routes through Lodge Wood

**Council Response:** 389/15, just outside, alongside boundary only

---

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:** Off Priory Close - 300m

**Council Response:** Environmental Space off Priory Close and Home Farm Playground.

---

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Lodge Hill Primary School (750m). Caerleon Comprehensive (1.5km)

---

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:** No.

---

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:** Creation of public viewpoint with panoramic views of city not currently accessible by public.

---

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:** No.

---

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:** Services close by serving existing development

---

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.
### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1501.C1 30/04/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Parkwood Close, Caerleon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Representation Text:

Yes.

**Welsh Water Comments**

**Sewerage**

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site useage.

**Sewage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

**Nash Waste Water Treatment Works**

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

No.

16/02/2012
**Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed**

**by: Representation No**

**Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1501.C1</td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Parkwood Close, Caerleon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

*Representation Text:* Contained by existing residential development to south, firm boundary to west which serves as limit to western edge of Caerleon, woodland to north and reservoir/mast installations to east.

*Council Response:* Adjoins Caerleon settlement boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

*Representation Text:* Development of site would not set precedent for reasons above.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Parkwood House

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

*Representation Text:* No. Urban area boundary


**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

*Representation Text:* No.
Question: 8 Other Information?

**Representation Text:**

- PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004
- NEWPORT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
- SITE REPRESENTATION
- ON BEHALF OF
- MRS A BINNERSLEY

LAND AT PARKWOOD HOUSE, 7 PARKWOOD CLOSE, CAERLEON

APRIL 2009

SUMMARY SHEET

Client Mrs A Binnersley

Ref08.276

Description of development: Proposed residential development, land at Parkwood House, 7 Parkwood Close, Caerleon

Asbri Planning Ltd, 32 Lambourne Crescent, Cardiff Business Park, Llanishen, Cardiff CF14 5GG
Tel: 02920 750179
Fax: 02920 765071
Email: keith@asbriplanning.co.uk
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1.0 INTRODUCTION
1.1 This Submission Statement, which accompanies Candidate and Strategic Options Representation Forms, has been prepared on behalf of Mrs A Binnersley who owns land north of Parkwood Close which she wishes to promote for residential development. The site consists of enclosed grassland which is contained by woodland to the north. It is currently outside the urban boundary for Caerleon as defined in the Adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan, which follows the boundaries of residential properties to the south.

1.2 As procedures in the new Local Development Plan system involve the review of previously established settlement limits this submission is made in order that the land is identified in the new plan as a residential land allocation as a logical extension of existing development, and included in a revised settlement boundary for Caerleon.

1.3 It is acknowledged that the site has particular characteristics and a sympathetic form of development, which reduces the potential visual impact and preserves its best features, will be necessary.

1.4 This submission, therefore, in promoting the site for residential development will provide a description of the site at Section 2, review the planning policies relevant to the site at Section 3, provides an appraisal of the development at Section 4 and draws together the key points and conclusions at Section 5.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The submission site is located approximately 2 kilometres to the north-west of the Caerleon District Centre and some 4 kilometres north-east of Newport City Centre. It lies in an elevated position with extensive views of the River Usk and the urban area of Newport.

2.2 The irregular-shaped site is 1.13 hectares in area. It lies to the north-west of the Trinity View development on the edge of the urban area of Caerleon. The site comprises an enclosed area of grassland which merges with an area of scrubland, shrubs and young trees in its northern part. It occupies a south-facing slope. Beyond a fence, which forms the northern boundary of the site, there is an area of woodland, Lodge Wood, which falls away to the north.

2.3 The western boundary of the site is formed by a continuation of the field boundary which acts as the western limit of the Trinity View development. It represents a firm 'defensible' boundary to development with several mature trees. The adjoining parcel slopes down to Pillmawr Road to the south, a single carriageway lane which links Caerleon and Malpas.

2.4 Detached properties to the north of Parkwood Close lie below the southern boundary of the site, which runs along the rear of their garden areas. Access to the site would be through the curtilage of number 7, an architect-designed, detached residence. Sufficient width to achieve this exists along the eastern boundary and via the paddock area to the north.

2.5 To the east a post and wire fence separates the site from an area of scrubland and trees, north of which is a Welsh Water Dwr Cymru emergency covered reservoir. Two telecommunications masts also lie within this parcel, directly to the north-east of the submission site. Access to these installations is via a gap in properties along Trinity View.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

3.1 The policy basis for this submission derives from the content and scope of national planning guidance. It is submitted that the proposed residential development would be in accordance with national advice and guidance.

3.2 National Planning Guidance

Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) is the principal document, which sets out the land use policy context of the Welsh Assembly Government, for the consideration and evaluation of all types of development.

3.3 Planning Policy Wales confirms at Paragraph 4.1.1 that the planning system:-

"…is intended to help protect the amenity and environment of towns, cities and the countryside in the public interest while promoting high quality, sustainable development."
3.4 This advisory document confirms that a primary principle or basic premise of the planning system is that it:

"... must provide for an adequate and continuous supply of land, available and suitable for development to meet society’s needs. It must do this in a way that is consistent with overall sustainability principles and objectives..." (Para 1.2.2)

3.5 Planning Policy Wales promotes the notion of sustainable development as being central to all planning decisions in Wales. It defines sustainable development as:

"...development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." (Para. 2.1.1)

3.6 Paragraph 2.1 reiterates the duty placed on the Assembly, under Section 121 of the Government of Wales Act 1998, to promote sustainable development in the exercise of its functions. The Welsh Assembly Government is promoting sustainable development planning by placing sustainability at the heart of its decision-making process, through its strategic policies, including Planning Policy Wales (March 2002).

3.7 The document outlines a number of relevant sustainable development principles, chief amongst which is the promotion of resource efficient settlement patterns and minimising land-take. There is also recognition that the location of development should aim to reduce demand for travel, especially journeys by private car.

3.8 Similarly, in terms of providing a framework for the provision of housing, one of the key policy objectives of Planning Policy Wales is to:

"Ensure that all local communities - both urban and rural - have sufficient good quality housing for their needs..." (Para. 2.3.2)

3.9 Section 2.5 provides guidance for local authorities in achieving a sustainable settlement strategy in locating new development. It states that in their land allocation policies, local planning authorities should:

• "Promote sustainable patterns of development
• Maintain and improve the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town, district, local and village centres
• Foster development approaches that recognise the mutual dependence between town and country, thus improving linkages between urban areas and their rural surroundings."

3.10 Planning Policy Wales advises, in terms of the location of development in Paragraph 2.5.3, that:

"Local planning authorities should assess the extent to which community settlement strategies and new development are consistent with minimising the need to travel and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car. A broad balance between housing and employment opportunities should be promoted to minimise the need for long distance commuting. Local authorities should adopt policies to locate major generators of travel demand such as housing, employment, retailing, leisure and recreation, and community facilities, including libraries, schools and hospitals within existing urban areas or in other locations which are, or can be, well served by public transport, or can be reached by walking or cycling." (Para 2.5.3)

3.11 Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006: Housing replaces Chapter 9 of PPW and provides the framework for national housing planning policy. Paragraph 9.1.1 states that the Assembly Government will seek to provide:

"homes that are in good condition, in safe neighbourhoods and sustainable communities; and greater choice for people over the type of housing and the location they live in."

3.12 and to ensure that:

• "Previously developed land is used in preference to greenfield sites;
• New housing or residential environments are well designed, environmentally sound and make a significant contribution to promoting community regeneration and improving quality of life; and that
• "The overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of social and market housing that retains and, where practical, enhances important landscape and wildlife features in the development."

3.13 Paragraph 9.2.8 states that:

"In identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, local planning authorities should follow a search sequence, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good public transport links."
3.14 The MIPPS in paragraph 9.2.9 goes on to state that local planning authorities should consider the following criteria in deciding which sites to allocate for housing in their development plans:

- The availability of previously developed sites and empty or under-used buildings and their suitability for housing use;
- The location and accessibility of potential development sites to jobs, shops and services to modes other than the car, and the potential for improving such sustainability;
- The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure, including public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals) to absorb further development and the cost of adding further infrastructure;
- The ability to build sustainable communities to support new physical and social infrastructure, including consideration of the effect on the Welsh Language and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities;
- Physical and environmental constraint on development of land, including for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk, taking into account that such risk may increase as a result of climate change, and the location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes; and
- Compatibility with neighbouring established land uses which might be adversely affected by encroaching residential development.

3.15 The emerging Local Development Plan will be required to review the existing planning framework provided by the UDP and to make provision for future housing needs, including those of individual settlements in accommodating necessary levels of growth to maintain communities and facilities.

3.16 The following section will seek to establish that national planning guidance is supportive of residential development taking place on the submission site, given its positive sustainable development characteristics. In these circumstances, therefore, it is submitted that these aspects should be taken into account when assessing the allocation of the site for residential purposes through the LDP site selection process.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The new Newport Local Development Plan (LDP) is required to place an emphasis on sustainable development, transparency in the site selection process and a robust evidence base. Newport’s current Unitary Development Plan period ends in 2011 when the new LDP period commences. In terms of housing land supply, much reliance will continue to be placed on land to the east of the city, associated with the former Corus steelworks together with proposed greenfield releases around the village of Llanwern, ie the Eastern Expansion Area. Much of this land is dependant on major road linkages and there remains uncertainty over the timing of development.

4.2 Newport has been successful in recent years in securing development on sites along the River Usk, Old Town Dock, Mon Bank Sidings and other sustainable locations where existing and proposed forms of development are contributing positively to enhancing the image of the new City. Selective releases will be required, however, on the edge of the City and its ‘satellite’ settlements such as Caerleon, in order to maintain a range and choice of appropriate housing land opportunities. These will need to include relatively small sites where low density forms of development can be accommodated which reflect the existing settlement pattern of the area and where development can be accommodated which would not represent a major intrusion into the surrounding countryside.

4.3 As part of this submission representations are made on the LDP Strategic Options (also subject to consultation) which favour the above approach, ie encouraging appropriate development in settlements outside the main urban area of Newport in proportion to their range of facilities and capacity for accommodating growth.

4.4 This Section will consider the site in the context of established site selection criteria as identified in the national planning guidance described in the previous Section.

Consideration of the Site Against Established Site Selection Criteria

4.5 Planning Policy Wales and the Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/06 provide criteria for the identification of housing allocation sites as follows:
- The availability of previously developed sites and buildings;
- Accessibility to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car;
Availability of Previously Developed Sites

4.6 The site is not previously developed land. It is, however, on the edge of the settlement boundary for Caerleon as defined in the Newport Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The site would form a logical extension to the existing pattern of development which would be contained by the woodland to the north and the tree-lined field boundary to the west which already forms a distinct limit to development at Trinity View. To the south is existing development, whilst to the east are reservoir and telecommunications installations.

4.7 Development of the site would not, therefore, represent an intrusion into the wider countryside but is well contained by the above mentioned features. It would, therefore, ‘score’ highly in the search sequence referred to in paragraph 9.2.6 of Planning Policy Wales, as a settlement extension.

Accessibility

4.8 The site has sustainable credentials in that it is situated in reasonably close proximity to Caerleon District Centre, which has a range of services and retail outlets. A cycle path is proposed to be constructed north of the railway line which would link with the route along the western bank of the River Usk via Pillmawr Road, where a section has recently been constructed. This would also facilitate a direct route between Caerleon to the Centre to the south.

4.9 Bus services also pass close to the site. These include Service 2D Newport – Caerleon via St Julians, 2E Newport - Caerleon via Home Farm and Trinity View, 7 Newport-Cwmbran via St Julians (7B via Caerleon Road). These operate along Lodge Road at a half-hourly frequency in each direction Monday to Saturday and 2-hourly on Sundays. The re-opening of passenger rail facilities proposed near the St Cadocs Hospital site is proposed to serve Caerleon.

Capacity of Infrastructure

4.10 It is not anticipated that infrastructure provision presents a major obstacle to development. An improved access would be provided via No 7 Parkwood Close which is also in the ownership of Mrs Binnersley. Sufficient land exists to achieve a suitable carriageway width and footway. It is acknowledged that the existing double garage may need to be demolished in order to achieve this. If necessary the garage could be replaced by a new building elsewhere in the curtilage of the property.

Ability to Build Communities

4.11 It is not anticipated that the development would have a negative impact on the community, including the Welsh Language. It would provide for housing opportunities for local people who otherwise may seek to move elsewhere.

Physical and Environmental Constraints

4.12 There are no major constraints to development subject to an appropriate form of access being achieved. It is acknowledged that parts of the site in its northern section may need to be retained as an open area to avoid impact on the ridgeline. As the site is overlooked by the masts on the adjacent site, however, the ridgeline at this location has already been compromised. Such a retained, open area would nevertheless provide amenity value as a ‘viewpoint’ for appreciating the fine views available from the site. The site is also included in a ‘green wedge, area in the Unitary Development Plan. However, development of the site would not compromise the purpose of the green wedge in separating settlements as it would not result in a narrowing of the open gap between Caerleon and Malpas.

Compatibility with neighbouring, established uses

4.13 Residential development on the site would be fully compatible with adjacent residential uses. A low density scheme which reflects the existing pattern of development would be most appropriate on the site. It would also meet accepted site selection criteria. It is, therefore, requested that favourable regard should be given to allocating the site for residential uses through the Local Development Plan process.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS
5.1 This Promotional Submission Statement has been prepared on behalf of Mrs A Binnersley who owns the site concerned. The site consists of enclosed grassland which is contained by woodland to the north. It is currently outside the urban boundary for Caerleon as defined in the Adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan.

5.2 A sympathetically-designed scheme would consolidate the existing settlement pattern on a site which has sustainability credentials in that it lies close to education and leisure facilities, public transport routes, and within a reasonable walking distance of Caerleon District Centre and is, due to recent improvements, within cycling distance of Newport City Centre.

5.3 Section 4 described the extent to which the proposal accords with the relevant planning policies and in doing it is possible to conclude that the site represents an opportunity to provide housing at a location where the established development limits to the west of Caerleon would not be compromised and where a sympathetic form of development could be achieved.

5.4 In the light of all the aforementioned circumstances, it is considered that the proposed residential development at this location would be in accordance with national advice and guidance and also accords with accepted site selection criteria.

5.5 Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that in assessing Candidate Site Submissions in the emerging Newport Local Development Plan, the site in question is identified as a housing land allocation and included within a revised urban boundary.

Asbri Planning Ltd
April 2009

Question: 9  Map Included?  Yes.
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

**1510 Newport Golf Club**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1510.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land at Newport Golf Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 92/ Newport Golf Club

**Question:** Representation Texts

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

Tree/Hedgerows on site should be retained where deemed beneficial for the enhancement or maintenance of biodiversity and green infrastructure.

SINC Oaktree Cottage (Crumlin Arm); Newport Environmental Space (Policy CE33); Cefn Council Wood (East & West) is a SINC. It should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted.

The design of development should seek to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area. This could include the enhancement of the canal as a tourism attraction and the inclusion of tourist accommodation in the designations. This will also include the avoidance of any pollution to the watercourse.

It is recommended that there is no loss to community facilities, notably the allotments under site 1232.C1 and 53.C1. This part of the site should be retained as allotments.

The development of the settlement should seek to ensure that there is an appropriate range of local services and facilities within walking distance from residences, including health facilities.

It should be ensured that the development of the sites incorporates walking and cycling routes to connect to the national cycle network as well as to services and facilities including employment and education.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

The candidate site is a greenfield site positioned outside the main urban area of Rogerstone, in an area designated as Green Wedge. The allocation of this site for residential purposes would be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that the site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing site.

**Question:** Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land at Newport Golf Club

**Question:** Location

**Representation Text:** Land adjoining Mountain Road - 3rd and 4th Fairway.

**Question:** Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 274 895

**Council Response:** 327344 189520
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Latest?</th>
<th>Representations</th>
<th>Council Responses</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1510.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land at Newport Golf Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

- **Representation Text:** One hectare
- **Council Response:** 1.01ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

- **Representation Text:** Gently sloping tended grassland roughly triangular in shape bordered by mature hedges.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

- **Representation Text:** Part of golf course.

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

- **Representation Text:** Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

- **Representation Text:** No. Not previously developed but currently in use as a golf course.
- **Council Response:** A golf course would constitute a Greenfield site.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representation Text:** The site adjoining Mountain Road lies in a slightly depressed location between an area of mature woodland and existing housing. Development for housing would have minimal impact on the landscape and it could be integrated successfully with adjoining areas.
- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and fringe Public Open Space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Public Open Space, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Mature hedges board two sides of the site and are not subject to any specific planning protection.
- **Council Response:** There are no Tree Protection Orders for this site. Adjacent to TPO’d woodland and trees, 58/Mon and 24/2001. additional trees with TPO potential.
### Biodiversity and Landscape Features

**Question: 3.14**

**Representation Text:** The present closely tended nature of the land does not provide great attraction in wildlife terms. Housing and its associated garden areas could provide a wider spectrum of habitat and greater diversity.

### Green Space and Corridor Enhancement

**Question: 3.15**

**Representation Text:** No. The development would have a neutral effect on wildlife corridors.

### Archaeology

**Question: 3.16**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

### Greenfield

**Question: 3.2**

**Representation Text:** No. Developed for use for golf.

**Council Response:** A golf course would constitute a Greenfield site.

### Contaminated Land Risk

**Question: 3.3**

**Representation Text:** No.

### Flood Risk

**Question: 3.4**

**Representation Text:** No.

### Adjacent to Water Course

**Question: 3.5**

**Representation Text:** No.

### Topography / Stability Problems

**Question: 3.6**

**Representation Text:** No.

### SSSI

**Question: 3.7**

**Representation Text:** No.

### Protected Species

**Question: 3.8**

**Representation Text:** No.

### Conservation Area or Listed Building

**Question: 3.9**

**Representation Text:** No.
## Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**Rep’n/Para/Policy** | **AccessnNo** | **DateLodgd** | **Late?** | **Source** | **Type** | **Mode** | **Status** | **Status Modified** | **Summary**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1510.C1 | | 06/05/2009 | | P | P | W | M | | Summary: Candidate site for residential development onland at Newport Golf Club

### Council Response:
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

#### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. The likely amount of traffic developed by the modest development envisaged could be accommodated satisfactorily on existing highways.
- **Council Response:**
  - Yes - mountain road
  - Very narrow, unsuitable for additional traffic.
  - Lack of visibility for new access. No footways. No street lighting.
  - Possible access through croesllefo gardens.

#### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** Close to an extensive PROW system on the golf course and leading to the wider countryside.
- **Council Response:**
  - The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. Off-site contributions for outdoor play facilities locally will be required. This site does not currently contribute to the outdoor play provision across the City as golf courses fall outside the definition of outdoor play as provided by Fields In Trust (formerly NPFA).

#### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** It would place more people within range of the existing good facilities.
- **Council Response:**
  - 200 metres
  - High cross road 1.4km
  - Ruskin avenue 500m

#### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
- **Representation Text:** 200 metres
- **Council Response:**
  - High cross road 1.4km
  - Ruskin avenue 500m

#### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
- **Representation Text:** At least 2 per hour.
- **Council Response:**
  - 20 min freq
  - 1hr freq

#### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Council Response:** Newport station 4.5km

#### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** 1 kilometre also Tesco Express proposed distance just over 1 kilometre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1510.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land at Newport Golf Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:** shop cefn walk 1.2km

**Question: 4.6** Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

*Representation Text:* Good.

**Question: 4.7** Walking and Cycling?

*Representation Text:* Neutral effect.

*Council Response:* no footways on mountain road or lanes leading to celn walk etc.

**Question: 4.8** Public Rights of Way?

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 4.9** Open Space?

*Representation Text:* 200 metres

*Council Response:* Informal open space RS8 - Land of Groves Road in the vicinity - 100m

**Question: 5.1** Schools?

*Representation Text:* Yes. Ruskin Avenue and Highcross

**Question: 5.2** Community Engagement?

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 5.3** Community Aspirations?

*Representation Text:* No adverse effects.

**Question: 5.4** Loss of Recreational Facilities?

*Representation Text:* No. The small area of the golf course that would be used would be replaced by similar facilities within the existing course to no detrimental effect.

**Question: 6.1** Infrastructure Proximity?

*Representation Text:* To the best of our knowledge all main service available.

**Question: 6.2** Neighbouring Development Issues?

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 6.3** Infrastructure Capacity?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1510.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land at Newport Golf Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

**Welsh Water Comments**

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

Representation Text: Adjoins existing residential development.

Council Response: Adjacent to but not within settlement boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

Representation Text: Logical rounding off.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
## Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

**Representation Text:**
No.

## Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. 7+

## Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The area of land where residential development would be acceptable in principle would need to be extended. The area is Countryside and Green Wedge. It is outside but adjacent to the settlement boundary.

## Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
04/0862 ERECTION OF 2NO. DETACHED DWELLINGS (REVISED SCHEME)
Granted with conditions 30-Jul-2004

## Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?

**Representation Text:**
No.

## Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

**Representation Text:**
No.

## Question: 9 Map Included?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1511.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Allocation of site for mixed use development including residential, commercial and office development reflecting outline app 07/1322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: SA Recommendation**

*Council Response:*

In addition to the highway works proposed as part of the scheme, it is recommended that it includes improvements to sustainable transport including walking and cycling and public transport improvements. It is recommended that no sleeping accommodation is provided on the ground floor of development. Close to SAC, SINC and SSSI it should be ensured that the development and any associated works and traffic will not lead to negative effects on the environmental designations or their occupants in accordance with the River’s Edge Strategy. It should be ensured that the encouragement of public accessibility to the river does not compromise its features in terms of its environmental designation.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

*Council Response:*

The Candidate site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Shaftsbury. It is recommended for inclusion within the Local Development Plan as a regeneration allocation for a mix of residential, leisure and commercial uses. Supplementary Planning Guidance was produced as part of the Unitary Development Plan and its broad principles remain in place for this key gateway site for Newport.

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

*Representation Text:*

Crindau Gateway Regeneration Site

**Question: 2.2 Location**

*Representation Text:*

Crindau Gateway Regeneration Site

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

*Council Response:*

331386 189505

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

*Representation Text:*

11.04 hectares

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

*Representation Text:*

Relatively flat site located to the west of the River Usk. The site is bounded by Albany Street to the west, Crindau Pill to the south and east, and the M4 to the north.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

*Representation Text:*

The site comprises a mixed industrial area that incorporates vacant land and other industrial and commercial premises.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1511.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Allocation of site for mixed use development including residential, commercial and office development reflecting outline app 07/1322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text:

An outline planning application (ref 07/1322) was submitted to Newport City Council in October 2008 for the proposed redevelopment of the site. The proposals are for the mixed use regeneration of land at Crindau Gateway comprising:

- a range of new homes including apartments, houses, student accommodation and some sheltered accommodation for the elderly (Use Classes C2 and C3);
- a hotel (Use Class C1);
- commercial and office development (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8);
- a local centre incorporating small-scale retail / local bars, cafes, and licensed premises (Use Classes A1, A2, A3 and D2), and healthcare and fitness facilities (Use Classes D1 and D2);
- new internal roads, car parking, service yards, accesses, paths and highway safety improvements;
- a flood defence scheme incorporating soft and hard treatment to the banksides and associated landscaping works; a network of open spaces, including recreation space, public realm and provision for pedestrians / cyclists; and other ancillary works, uses and activities.

And requiring

- site clearance, treatment and preparation, including demolition of existing buildings;
- the installation of new services and infrastructure;
- improvements and works to the highway network, and
- other ancillary works and activities.

Reference is made throughout this response form to the current planning application.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

Representation Text: Yes. As set out above, the site currently comprises a range of commercial and industrial premises and clearly represents previously developed land within the urban area.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Representation Text: The site occupies a key gateway location to Newport and accommodates a range of industrial and employment premises that are generally run down in appearance. The site borders the River Usk and Crindau Pill and does not, in its current state, make a positive contribution towards the river front area. The redevelopment of this area would greatly improve the local landscape through comprehensive and lasting regeneration of high quality design.

Council Response: Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1511.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Allocation of site for mixed use development including residential, commercial and office development reflecting outline app 07/1322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. The site offers sufficient scope for the creation of green spaces and corridors and the planning application is supported by a Development Framework which sets out the open space strategy.

**Council Response:**

As set out in 3.8 above, the planning application was supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment and a comprehensive River's Edge Strategy has been prepared to enhance and protect key biodiversity and landscape features.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Council Response:**

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Alongside Crindau Pill, potential settlement site and port. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Contamination at the site is related to the historic industrial processes undertaken in the area. This has been fully assessed as part of the planning application, which has shown that the site is capable of effective remediation.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Site lies within Zone C1 of the TAN 15 Development Advice Maps. The planning application for the site is supported by a full Flood Consequences Assessment, which proposes a land raise solution to overcome flood risk. This has been agreed by the Environment Agency.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. The site lies to the west of Crindau Pill, with part of the site also lying adjacent to the River Usk.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:**

No. Site lies adjacent to the River Usk which is protected by the statutory designations of Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Crindau Pill, which forms the eastern boundary of the site, is included within the Monmouthshire-Brecon Canal (Main Arm) Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC).

**Council Response:**

Adjacent to SINC - Monmouthshire and Brecon Canal
Adjacent to SAC - River Usk/Afon Wysg
Adjacent to SSSI - River Usk (Lower Usk)/Afon Wysg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
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**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The likelihood of protected species (e.g. otters) never the site has been addressed by the Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken in connection with the current planning application. A River's Edge Strategy has been produced to mitigate any impact and provide habitat enhancement in connection with the proposals. This strategy has been agreed with CCW and the EA.

**Council Response:**

**Answer:** Yes. The Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application demonstrates that the proposals can be accommodated within the existing highway network.

**Representation Text:** Yes. The Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application demonstrates that the proposals can be accommodated within the existing highway network. New Hendeflein way link will improve capacity for development.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Council Response:** A network of open spaces is proposed throughout the development linked by pedestrian / cycle routes.

**Answer:** The proposed development falls within the Shaftesbury Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.58Ha. A LEAP provision will be required on-site to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, with off-site contribution to upgrade formal play facilities at Shaftesbury Park being required.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Answer:** Any of the following services can be used into and out of the City's bus station:

- Newport to Malpas (3 3A 3B 3 C 3X);
### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:** Approximately 1km via existing pedestrian routes.

**Council Response:** Newport

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:** Site is adjacent to the of an approved Sainsbury supermarket, which is expected to be developed in the near future.

**Council Response:** Malpas Rd shops 300m-1km, new Sainsbury's store 400m city centre 1km

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:** The site is highly accessible to both the City Centre and surrounding areas where there are a range of employment opportunities. The development proposals for the site include an element of employment development and a neighbourhood centre that would provide accessible local job opportunities and community facilities.

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

**Representation Text:** The River's Edge Strategy proposed within the Development Framework for the site includes a pedestrian/cycleway along the banks of Crindau Pill. The development area will also be linked to other areas by a network of pathways that will link with the internal network to the site.

**Council Response:** Cycle way immediately next to, but not within, eastern and southern boundaries. New infrastructure within development existing flyway + cycleway links to NCN.

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?

**Representation Text:** Areas of open space are provided within the site as part of the development proposals.

**Council Response:** Formal - Shafestbury Park, 3 soccer pitches and 1 rugby pitch

### Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:** Crindau Primary school is located within close proximity to the site. Shaftesbury Park provides a valuable open space resource for the local community.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
1511.C1 05/05/2009 P W ME

Summary: Allocation of site for mixed use development including residential, commercial and office development reflecting outline app 07/1322

Yes. A public exhibition was held in December 2007 and a Statement of Community Involvement submitted to the Council. The exercise identified overwhelming community support for the proposals.

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

Representation Text: The redevelopment of this area would provide a range of improvements that would meet community aspirations. The proposals will deliver environmental improvements, community facilities, new open spaces, a district centre and employment opportunities.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Representation Text: Site is served by all these services.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text: No. Comprehensive redevelopment of the area allows for a broad range of uses to be developed with appropriate design considerations allowing for development to take place without conflict between different uses.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text: Yes.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

We have provided comment previously on the proposed development sites within this catchment, in particular the proposed Crindau Gateway redevelopment. As we have advised, it is unlikely that the existing public sewerage system can accommodate the sewerage flows that would be generated by this proposed development. As such it is likely that off-site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off-site works can be determined appropriately. However, we have also advised that subject to removal of surface water from the public combined sewerage system we may be in a position to consider further communication of foul flows with the public sewerage system. A suitable condition has been incorporated within the planning consent for this development site to protect our position.

Water supply

We have advised previously that a water supply can be provided to serve the Crindau Sainsbury’s store and the residential development located on former Sainsbury’s site. It has also been highlighted that a water supply can be made to serve the large Crindau Gateway development however, this would be subject to consideration of the proposed future site layout and usage. In the event that the water mains local to the development cannot adequately supply the site the developer may need to contribute to the provision of off-site water mains as appropriate. We can advise on this matter further following provision of detailed site proposals when available.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works
Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.1 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. This will be a matter determined by detailed design proposals.

**Question: 6.2 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** Development would be a major brownfield opportunity within an existing urban area.

**Question: 6.3 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** Not applicable. Redevelopment of this key brownfield site would reduce pressure to develop in less sustainable / greenfield locations.

**Question: 6.4 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** No. Crindau Gateway Ltd holds a controlling interest over the vast majority of the site.

**Question: 6.5 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** No. Agent - acting on behalf of Crindau Gateway Ltd.

**Question: 6.6 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.7 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.
### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:**
No. Site is allocated for regeneration within the adopted Newport UDP.

**Council Response:**

HEAD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION: National Cycle Route 47 crosses Lyne Road adjacent to junction with Edwin Street and then continues along Edwin Street. The increase of traffic generated by the proposal could lead to conflict between vehicles and cyclists. Suggest that mitigation by way of improved crossing facility on Lyne road or realignment of cycle route should be provided.

Refused - The use is contrary to the land use outlined in Policies ED2 and H1 (14 and 45) of the Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 (Adopted May 2006).

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**

CHANGE OF USE TO FORM SCRAP METAL RECYCLING AND STORAGE FACILITY
07/0954 1st nov 2007 Refused

HEAD OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION: National Cycle Route 47 crosses Lyne Road adjacent to junction with Edwin Street and then continues along Edwin Street. The increase of traffic generated by the proposal could lead to conflict between vehicles and cyclists. Suggest that mitigation by way of improved crossing facility on Lyne road or realignment of cycle route should be provided.

Refused - The use is contrary to the land use outlined in Policies ED2 and H1 (14 and 45) of the Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 (Adopted May 2006).

WAREHOUSE FACILITY FOR THE STORAGE AND RECYCLING OF RECYCLABLE METALLIC AND NON METALLIC MATERIALS
06/0007 30th Mar 2006 Granted

RETENTION OF USE OF LAND TO FORM EXTENSION TO ADJOINING TRANSPORT YARD PARKING AND MANOEUVRING AREA (RESUBMISSION)
05/1503 2nd nov 2006 Granted with Conditions

HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: The change of use will enlarge the Transport Yard thus increasing traffic generation. Such increase is not acceptable putting further strain on the access to Harlequin Roundabout.

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: Initial objection removed provided that a condition is imposed to control the hours during which works can be carried out to the fence to prevent disturbance to otters.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Originally requested a Site Level Survey to ascertain whether a Flood Risk Assessment was needed. Amended comments to acceptable as long as no site level takes place on site. Conditions must be attached restricting area from maintenance or cleaning of vehicles and a pollution prevention method statement must be submitted and approved.

TEMPORARY OPEN STORAGE OF WATER TANKS AND SKIPS, TOGETHER WITH THE SMALL SCALE SORTING OF SHEARING SCRAP
08/0320 10 Apr 2008 Refused

HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: Has concerns regarding the potential increase in heavy goods vehicles to and from the site in a predominantly residential area. The applicant has not provided details of access or parking at the site. In view of the concerns raised, therefore opposes the application.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES: Objects to the application due to the noise from the operations which will have a detrimental affect on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 47 HOUSES AND 18 FLATS
93/0871 7 Mar 2001 Refused

MIXED-USE REGENERATION SCHEME COMPRISING A RE-LOCATED SAINDSBURYS SUPERMARKET (CLASS A1) WITH AN ANCILLARY RESTAURANT/COFFEE SHOP AND PETROL FILLING STATION; A CLASS A3 RESTAURANT; CLASS C3 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE TOGETHER WITH ASSO
02/1414 24-Apr-2008 Refused

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Following the receipt of additional information, the Agency has no objections to the proposed scheme subject to the following matters being imposed as
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planning conditions:-
- building to be constructed at a minimum level of 9.44m AOD;
- car parking to be constructed at a minimum level of 8.84m AOD;
- surface water from the site to be discharged to a Dwr Cymru surface water sewer with attenuation provided on site designed to a 1 in 100 years standard;
- emergency access to and egress from the site to be provided by the proposed access ramp;
- flood bank/noise bund to be provided adjacent to Glassworks Cottage.

WELSH ASSEMBLY GOVERNMENT TRANSPORT DIRECTORATE: Satisfied that the highway improvements proposed for the A4042 trunk road roundabout at Grove Park and Headenheim Drive adequately mitigate the effects of the increased traffic generated by the proposed development. However, in order to ensure the free flow and safety to the trunk road, would advise that all highway improvements be completed before the development is brought into beneficial use.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH): A condition requiring the ground investigation should, therefore, be attached to any planning consent granted. This should include a full quantitative risk assessment, with a suitable remediation strategy being formulated on the basis of this assessment.

Conditions should also be attached to any consent granted to ensure that existing residents' health is not prejudiced and they are not subject to environmental nuisance. This would involve the preparation of a Management Plan which would need to be approved by the Local Planning Authority, and involve details of dust suppression measures, access for site traffic, control of noise, hours of operation, piling scheme, monitoring of noise and vibration and appointment of an Environmental Liaison Officer.

Details of noise mitigation works would also need to be approved.

SUSTRANS: Considers that the scheme as it stands, would be detrimental to the City Centre as the relocation of the Sainsbury Store would remove it from a central location and make it less accessible. It would also bring more traffic to a residential area and encourage out of town shopping with more private car trips.

Any layout should, therefore, provide better linkages and improvement of the existing subway. An alternative link for pedestrians and cyclists should also be provided into the development from Albany Street. The National Cycle Network Route 47 passes close to the site at its southern end and links should be made to this.

The proposed junction of the new access road and the A4042, as well as the ramp are extremely hazardous for cyclists, and there needs to be a major improvement in this aspect of the scheme, as well as at the new roundabout on Albany Street.

DWR CYMRU: Foul and surface water should be discharged separately from the site, and no surface water or land drainage run-off should discharge to the public sewerage system. Suitable grease traps must be provided in the new system. If the development gives rise to a new discharge of trade effluent then a discharge consent is required.

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: Provided concerns are addressed through appropriate planning conditions or agreement would have no objections to the scheme. Main concern relates to the loss of any reference to the requirements of the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994. The first step when considering the implications of the proposal is whether it is likely to have a significant effect on the cSAC, with an appropriate assessment being the second step. In this instance of the opinion that provided no contaminated discharge is released into the River Usk during the construction and operation of the development, the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect on the River Usk cSAC. With respect to the SSSI, the main concerns are the same as for the cSAC. In principle, therefore, it should be possible to address concerns through the implementation of appropriate planning conditions.

NEWPORT UNLIMITED: The area of Crindau falls within the scope of the Central Area Masterplan. Newport Unlimited supports the principle of locating a superstore in the City Centre, but should this not come forward, a relocated Sainsbury on this site, together with a “basket” shopping facility within the City Centre would seem acceptable.

EDUCATION AND LEISURE: Local Primary School is at capacity and comprehensive is above capacity. Education contribution is, therefore, required to upgrade education provision.

Local playing facility is in need of upgraded play equipment, and contribution towards this should also be requested.

HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: There would normally be a recommendation to refuse consent for a development which involved a new access off the A4042, but it is clear that in this instance this will help in the long term regeneration of Crindau. The submitted Transport Assessment has confirmed that the proposed junction is acceptable in terms of capacity. A safety audit has also been undertaken which has been agreed with the applicants.

The works to construct the new access must be carried out by the Council, and be the subject of a Section 106 Legal Agreement. The applicants have also agreed to fund the traffic controlled signaling at the Harlequin roundabout and possible traffic management on Albany Street. These again will need to be subject of the legal agreement.

CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING BUILDING FROM INDUSTRIAL TO A KARTING CENTRE WITH SUPPORT FACILITIES TOGETHER WITH ON SITE TEMPORARY STORAGE FOR CARS

90/1080 04-Jan-1991 Granted with Conditions
**Representation No 1511.C1**
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---

**ERECITION OF 14 UNITS FOR CLASS B1 USE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND RIVERSIDE WALK**

90/0125 02-Mar-1992 GC52

---

**RELOCATION OF LORRY REFUELLING FACILITY AND INSTALLATION OF A NEW 10 000 GALLON FUEL TANK**

92/0189 16-Apr-1992 GC

---

**USE OF BUILDING FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF LORRIES THE OPEN STORAGE AND LOADING/UNLOADING OF FERROUS AND NON-FERROUS METALS**

92/1081 05-Feb-1993 ISSUED LDCE

---

**ERECITION OF NEW FLOUR SILO YEAST SYSTEM PLANT SYSTEM AND REPOSITIONING OF EXISTING PORTACABIN**

95/0686 29-Sep-1995 GC

---

**CONSTRUCTION OF CYCLEPATH TO FORM PART OF NATIONAL CYCLE NETWORK**

96/1024 28-Jan-1997 G

---

**MIXED USE REGENERATION OF SITE INCLUDING RESIDENTIAL, STUDENT ACCOMMODATION, AND SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION FOR THE ELDERLY (CLASSES C2 AND C3); AN HOTEL (CLASS C1); COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS AND OFFICES (CLASS B1); A LOCAL CENTRE INCLUDING RETAIL, LEISURE AND**

07/1322 COMMITTEE GC

---

**HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION:** The current highway capacity is insufficient to support the maximum number of dwellings assumed in the submitted Transport Assessment. Further analysis has been undertaken on behalf of the Council to ascertain what the maximum number of residential units would be and has been determined that the UDP estimated allocation of 420 units would be the upper limit. A condition to restrict the residential element of the development to this figure is therefore necessary. A financial contribution towards improvements to the Lyne Road Bridge junction to enable buses to access the site and to reflect the regeneration of the area is required along with any land necessary to achieve this. In order to pump prime a bus service which would then be available to early occupants of the development (first five years from first occupation) before the service became self-sustaining a financial contribution of £250,000 would be required.

---

**HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

Contaminated Land

The proposed development site encompasses a number of recent and historic land uses that are likely to have caused potential contamination. There are also some concerns regarding the migration of mobile contaminants from the adjacent former Crindau gasworks site, in the direction of the River Usk. Therefore conditions are recommended in the event that planning permission is granted requiring contamination investigation and mitigation and restrictions on imported soil materials.

DWR CYMRU – WELSH WATER. A surface water trade off based on the details submitted is acceptable. On the basis that the surface water will be removed from the system, DCWW do not raise objection. However, before DCWW can approve a connection of the foul flow from the development they will need to see a comprehensive drainage scheme. DCWW therefore recommend conditions to ensure these requirements are met.

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: In terms of the possible impacts on the integrity of the River Usk Special Area of Conservation (SAC) CCW raised concerns pending an appropriate assessment carried out by NCC. These concerns related to possible discharge of contaminants with potential resultant impacts on protected fish and otters; potential disturbance to otters and migrating fish; loss and/or obstruction of otter habitat/movement corridors; that future proposals for a marina, locks and canal link could jeopardise the viability of mitigation proposals for the current planning application. CCW have now seen the appropriate assessment carried out by NCC and consider that provided the conditions are fully implemented any adverse impacts on the SAC would be avoided. CCW therefore raise no objection to the proposals in terms of impact on the SAC. CCW also recommend that in relation to bats, habitat associated with bat flightlines is retained and that lighting is sympathetic which should be controlled by conditions.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Raise no objections of flooding grounds subject to mitigation works being carried out in accordance with the principles of the Flood Consequences Assessment (FCA) and FCA Addendum and subject to detailed flood mitigation design calculations being submitted at the reserved matters stage. These calculations will ultimately provide the required mechanisms that should be implemented to effectively manage flood risk. The flood alleviation works would result in edge treatment constructed to a level of 9.08 metres above ordnance datum (AOD) which is predicted to guard against a 1 in 1000 year extreme Stillwater tide level in year 2054.

In terms of biodiversity issues initial concerns over the potential detrimental impact on natural riverbank habitat have been addressed through the submission of the Development Framework including a River’s Edge Strategy (amongst other things this states that a 7 metre buffer would be established and maintained along the edge of the Pill and maximising the...
use of bank reproufling and ‘soft’ engineering mechanisms such as timber cribs rather than hard approaches such as sheet piling). The EA also consider that it is positive that ecological issues have been put at the forefront in developing the River’s Edge Strategy and state that it is critical that the recommendations in the Ecology section are followed. The EA request that they be able to comment on the proposed ‘Management Plan’ referred to in the Development Framework and would also wish to see reference to concerns about impact on fish relating to timing of construction and possible impact on migrating fish covered in that document.

In terms of potential contamination of the River Usk Special Area of Conservation (SAC) this is regarded as a high priority site because of the sensitivity of groundwater as a pathway to the river. Conditions are therefore recommended requiring detailed reports to ensure controlled waters are adequately protected.

A number of conditions relating to ecological, flooding and contamination issues are recommended.

ERECTION OF 14 UNITS FOR CLASS B1 USE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND RIVERSIDE WALK

No: Date: Decision 90/0125 02kMark1992 GC

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?

The site is a mixed industrial area with a mixed planning history. No previous applications (prior to the October 2007 scheme) have been made for the comprehensive redevelopment of the area.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

An outline planning application (Ref 07/1322) was submitted to Newport City Council in October 2008. This has yet to be determined.

Question: 8 Other Information?

Crindau Gateway Ltd has submitted an outline planning application for the comprehensive redevelopment of its land interests at Crindau, an existing commercial and industrial area lying to the north of Newport city centre. The application brings together approximately 11 hectares of brownfield land suitable and capable of delivering comprehensive and lasting mixed use regeneration. The application was submitted in October 2007 and has been subject to extensive consultation. The principle of residential led mixed use regeneration at the site is clearly established in planning policy terms and the proposed regeneration of the site would support a number of key Newport City Council strategies. The site forms part of the Crindau Gateway designation in the adopted UDP. This identifies the Crindau area as a key gateway site to be brought forward for comprehensive redevelopment. The proposed development is also consistent with the recently adopted Crindau Development Brief prepared as supplementary planning guidance by the Council. As well as being in line with local planning policy and strategy, the mixed use redevelopment of the site also accords with planning policy at the national level which encourages the beneficial reuse of previously developed land in urban areas.

In terms of its clear suitability for mixed use regeneration, this was demonstrated by the technical assessments submitted in support of the outline planning application. These covered matters such as access, flood risk, ground conditions, and ecology. The principal conclusions of the technical investigations are summarised below:

- the outline masterplan and Development Framework illustrate the site’s potential to accommodate a high quality residential-led mixed use regeneration scheme, offering high levels of amenity space;
- the Environmental Statement highlights that the development of the site will not result in any significant detrimental impact on the nature conservation resource;
- the Transportation Assessment demonstrates that there is adequate capacity within the highway network to accommodate the proposed development; and
- the land raise solution proposed by the Flood Consequences Assessment, and approved by the Environment Agency, will address flood risk at the site and provide protection to both existing as well as new residents.

The site’s inherent suitability and acceptability as a brownfield regeneration opportunity within the urban area is unquestionable. The site is subject to an outline planning application that is at an advanced stage, and its proposals are entirely compatible with the recently adopted SPG for the area. Crindau Gateway presents an important opportunity to deliver the sustainable, effective and beneficial regeneration of a significant gateway site in close proximity to Newport city centre. In this light, the current proposals for the site need to be reflected as committed development in the emerging LDP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1511.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Allocation of site for mixed use development including residential, commercial and office development reflecting outline app 07/1322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** 9  
**Map Included?**  
**Representation Text:** Yes.
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1521.C1 05/05/2009 P W ME Summary: Proposed residential/mixed use development on land at Herbert Road

Site: 93/ Herbert Road

Question: Representation Texts

Question: SA Recommendation
Council Response: May help to improve city centre investment adjacent to deprived area of Pillgwenlly: this effect should be ensured through design measures to improve accessibility and legibility. It should be ensured that clear, safe and direct walking and cycling routes are provided to connect the site to the city centre, as well as to recreational areas.
Flood zone C1: SUDS should be incorporated throughout the site.
Adjacent to watercourse: SSSI and SAC: any potential effects should be mitigated prior to development to ensure no negative effects. Development on the site should seek to connect to and enhance the ecological value of the area, integrating with the river corridor.
Site could enhance landscape appearance next to river – it should be ensured that the design of development is sympathetic to the local environment.

Question: Overall Council Response
Council Response: The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of St Julians. It is recommended for inclusion within the Local Development Plan for mixed use development comprising residential and appropriate commercial uses. The site has the potential to regenerated a previously developed site and provide a section of a continuous riverside link for the River Usk, a key priority for the Council as achieved across the East and West banks of the river to the south of the site.

Question: 2.1 Site Name
Representation Text: Land at Herbert Road

Question: 2.2 Location
Representation Text: Herbert Road, Newport

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
Council Response: 329923 191063

Question: 2.4 Site Area
Representation Text: 0.68 - 1.7 acres
Council Response: 1.15Ha

Question: 2.5 Brief Description
Representation Text: Flat open site with access

Question: 2.6 Current Use
Representation Text: Vacant

16/02/2012
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**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Proposed Use(s):** Residential / mixed use

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Employment use.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** Very poor and requiring extensive improvement. No intrusion likely.
  - **Council Response:** Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
  - **Council Response:** TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- **Representation Text:** Significant potential for improvement of local area and clean up of site.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
  - **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
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**Summary:** Proposed residential/mixed use development on land at Herbert Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td><strong>Flood Risk?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Yes. As part of the overall development scheme for the area - close to River Usk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td><strong>Adjacent to Water Course?</strong>&lt;br&gt;No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td><strong>Topography / Stability Problems?</strong>&lt;br&gt;No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td><strong>SSSI?</strong>&lt;br&gt;No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td><strong>Protected Species?</strong>&lt;br&gt;No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td><strong>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</strong>&lt;br&gt;No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:&lt;br&gt;Listed building n/a&lt;br&gt;Ancient monuments n/a&lt;br&gt;Historic park n/a&lt;br&gt;Conservation area n/a&lt;br&gt;Within Newport boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td><strong>Access to Highway?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Yes.&lt;br&gt;Yes - Blackett Ave&lt;br&gt;Bankine close + Marconi Close very narrow, unsuitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackett Avenue - very narrow. O/s parking reduces width.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuitable w/o improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td><strong>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Link to the River Usk and Glebelands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16/02/2012
The proposed development falls within the St. Julians Ward that has a shortfall in Informal Play of 3.13Ha and Equipped Play of 2.54Ha. The proximity of the development to the Glebelands Recreation Grounds and Turner Street Play Area means that a request for an off-site contribution to upgrade play facilities locally will be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Bus Route?</td>
<td>Circa 700m or less depending on route.</td>
<td>Russel Drive/ Edison Rudge 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Bus Frequency</td>
<td>Not known.</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Railway Station?</td>
<td>1000m</td>
<td>Newport 4.5km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Convenience Shop?</td>
<td>Circa 700m or less depending on route taken to the town parade.</td>
<td>Russell Drive 400-600m Post office, shop, hairdressers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>Town centre site with good employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Walking and Cycling?</td>
<td>By provision of cycle stores and a green travel plan where appropriate.</td>
<td>Existing flyway network on highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Public Rights of Way?</td>
<td>Yes. Access road for the area is in the ownership of the applicant.</td>
<td>No PROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Open Space?</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
<td>Late?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

- Formal SJ1 - In extremely close proximity within 50m - Glebelands
- Equipped SJ9 - In close proximity - 75m - Turner Street

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
**Representation Text:** Yes. New Usk School project is part of the overall scheme and the site has already provided access for part of this project.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
**Representation Text:** Improving the local environment for residents.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
**Representation Text:** No. None.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
**Representation Text:** All available.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
**Representation Text:** No. Believed to be the case but further reports will need to be undertaken.

**Welsh Water Comments**

- **Sewerage**
  It is unlikely that there will be any objection to these proposed developments. However, formal comment will be reserved until details highlighting the likely housing density on these sites are available in order that we can comment appropriately.

- **Water supply**
  The water mains serving this area suffer from low pressure and therefore supplying the sites may not be possible without re-enforcement of off site infrastructure. We will be in a position to comment further upon provision of further details of the proposed developments.

- **Sewage treatment**
  These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works
Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4** Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 6.5** Logical Extension?

*Representation Text:* Surrounding by other developments and close to residential sites.

*Council Response:* The site is within the Settlement Boundary

**Question: 6.6** Precedent Setting?

*Representation Text:* The access road is the ownership of the applicant and has already been upgraded to the benefit of adjacent users. The owner is already in discussions with other adjacent landowners to promote the area on a comprehensive basis.

**Question: 7.1** Site Owned by Proposer?

*Representation Text:* Yes. Yes it is and owned by a Ltd company

**Question: 7.2** Site Owner?

*Representation Text:* No. Agent acting for the owner.

**Question: 7.3** Interest in Adjoining Land?

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.4** Restrictive Covenants?

*Representation Text:* No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1521.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential/mixed use development on land at Herbert Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.5</td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. 1 - 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.6</td>
<td>Development Boundary Change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response: The site is currently allocated as a housing proposal within the settlement boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.7</td>
<td>Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.8</td>
<td>Planning Application Refusals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.9</td>
<td>Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 8</td>
<td>Other Information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: This is a great cleared site that offers a chance to regenerate the immediate area. The owner also owns the access road and is keen to promote the site and others in the area. A number of professional and technical reports have already been commissioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 9</td>
<td>Map Included?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**1525**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> SA Recommendation</td>
<td>Any public rights of way should be maintained and enhanced through development of the sites. One of the sites is a SINC (Sneyd Park Wood); TPOs on sites: Development on the site should seek to connect to and enhance the ecological value of the area. It is recommended that any development likely to harm the environmental designations or protected species should not be permitted. Listed buildings likely to be affected (setting): the design of development should ensure that this effect is not negative. Monmouthshire and Brecon Canal Conservation Area adjacent- walking and cycling routes to benefit from this asset should be enhanced. Any potential for the development of employment uses for the tourism industry should be encouraged (this should be explored prior to development for residential use to ensure that any potential isn’t lost).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question: Overall Council Response | The site is a Greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Malpas. The majority of the site is designated as Countryside and the remaining portion, adjacent to the settlement boundary is allocated as environmental space. The land has also been identified as an area of moderate to high value in the LANDMAP assessment. The site also has a number of Tree Preservation Ordinances.  

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.  

Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.  

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8  

It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated as Countryside and Environmental Space and that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.1</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>Land at Blackett Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.2</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>Land at Blackett Avenue, Malpas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.3</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>ST 299 911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.4 Site Area</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.5 Brief Description</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.6 Current Use</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.1 Brownfield?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.15</strong></td>
<td>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.16</strong></td>
<td>Archaeology?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.2</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.3</strong></td>
<td>Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.4</strong></td>
<td>Flood Risk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.5</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.6</strong></td>
<td>Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.7</strong></td>
<td>SSSI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.8</strong></td>
<td>Protected Species?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.9</strong></td>
<td>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>Listed building n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic park n/a</strong></td>
<td>Conservation area (adjacent to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Access to Highway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Bus Route?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Bus Frequency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Railway Station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Convenience Shop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Walking and Cycling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Public Rights of Way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Open Space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525.C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Residential development on land at Blackett Avenue, Malpas

**Council Response:**

There are a few other pieces of open space in close proximity including:

- Equipped space at malpas playing fields and Malpas TA centre
- Formal space at Grove Park
- Informal space at Chapman Close

**Question:** 5.1 Schools?
**Representation Text:** Yes. The site is within walking distance of two local primary schools.

**Question:** 5.2 Community Engagement?
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 5.3 Community Aspirations?
**Representation Text:** We would be prepared to consult with the community on the layout of the development on this site.

**Question:** 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
**Representation Text:** As site is located within an existing residential development assume all services are available.

**Question:** 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:**

Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we
Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: The area is surrounded on three sides by residential development and a school.

Council Response: The site is located partially within the settlement boundary

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

Representation Text: Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Residential development on land at Blackett Avenue, Malpas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. 1 - 3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Currently designated as countryside and part of the site is allocated as environmental space, all of the site.
- **Council Response:** The site is allocated as environmental space in the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Residential development on land at Cambria Close, Caerleon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 95/ Cambria Close

16/02/2012
The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Caerleon. Planning permission was granted by Newport City Council for residential development and has been partially implemented. The proposed Candidate Site is the unimplemented section of this original permission. An application was submitted on the site in 2004 for residential development and subsequently withdrawn the officer recommendation for the site was to Grant with Conditions.

It is recommended that the Candidate Sites is allocated within the Local Development Plan for residential development.
**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Representation Text:** Development would be unintrusive as it is within an established housing development.

**Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of Moderate to High value in LANDMAP. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Boundary Trees TPO potential.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. An archaeological survey has highlighted the presence of Roman artefacts in the North Eastern corner of the site, this area could not be developed. The housing that has recently been built in the area has been built on raft foundations due to ground conditions and presence of antiquities.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In area of Roman settlement. Restraint. Archaeological evaluation carried out. Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** The site is brownfield.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No. Directly adjacent to a Blue C2 flood risk area. A flood risk assessment would be undertaken and any measures required taken.

**Council Response:** Part of site is within zone C2 flood risk.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
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Representation No 1525.C2
Date Lodged: 06/05/2009

Summary: Residential development on land at Cambria Close, Caerleon.

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.7 SSSI?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
Representation Text: Yes. Access had already been constructed.
Council Response: Yes. Access provided

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
Council Response: The proposed development falls within the Caerleon Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 3.64Ha. Owing to the small size of the site an off-site contributions for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
Representation Text: Established public transport. The development of this site would not impact / improve connectivity to public transport.

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
Representation Text: Bus stop located on Mill Street 300 metres to site boundary.
Council Response: 300 metres

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
Representation Text: At least every 30 mins
Council Response: 10-20 min freq

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
Newport Train Station - approx 4 miles.

**Council Response:**
- Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
  - Representation Text: The Village centre has a variety of shops which is within a 5 minute walk to the site.
  - Council Response: 600 metres to post office, 300 metres to shop

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
- Representation Text: The site lies within an established development and has access to the city centre and local community facilities.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- Representation Text: There are no designated walking / cycling routes within the immediate vicinity of the site.
  - Council Response: on site facilities infrastructure

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- Representation Text: Areas of open space are within walking distance.
  - Council Response: Formal open space is located at Rear of Cherry Tree Close

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- Representation Text: Yes. The site is within walking distance of Caerleon Endowed Primary School, which is a feeder school to Caerleon Comprehensive.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- Representation Text: The site is within an existing residential development. All services should be easily available. Enquiries would need to be made with the Statutory undertakers.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
Infrastructure Capacity?

Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Residential development on land at Cambria Close, Caerleon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representation Text:** Vacant site within an existing residential development.

**Council Response:** The site is within the settlement boundary

#### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

**Representation Text:** Site is self contained - there are no opportunities to develop adjoining land as it has already been developed for residential purposes.

#### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

#### Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

#### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?

**Representation Text:** Yes. 1-3 years

#### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** The site is allocated as a housing proposal within the UDP

#### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** ERECTION OF 20 TWO STOREY RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS INCLUDING ROADWORKS AND SITE DEVELOPMENT WORKS 98/0487 05-Oct-1998 GC

#### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
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### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

**Question Text:** Yes. 04/1257. Residential development comprising 7 no. detached dwellings. This has been withdrawn. A new application is to be submitted shortly.

### Question: 8 Other Information?

**Question Text:** The site is allocated for residential development in the adopted UDP (H1(37) Mill Street, Caerleon).

### Question: 9 Map Included?

**Question Text:** Yes.

---

### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

- It is recommended that the site does not go forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:
  - Adjacent to an Archeologically Sensitive Area and within Gwent Levels Historic Landscape Characterisation Area Trowbridge: Trowbridge: “a very remote area of landscape” - development likely to significantly affect the character of the area as would be a large increase in existing settlement size (especially cumulatively with Marshfield West allocation);
  - Bordered by SSSI; adjacent to SINC;
  - No designated open space for recreation- likely to lead to negative effects, from use of countryside areas for recreation, on designated sites for nature conservation;
  - Flood Zone C1;
  - May affect SPA; RAMSAR;
  - Would lead to loss of agricultural land and therefore employment in rural area- suggest site should include a mix of uses to include employment;
  - Likely to lead to significant increase in traffic dependent on volume of residential provision proposed- recommend development only be permitted if can be proven that public transport can be improved to increased frequency to centres of employment and the railway station;
  - Increased pollution from traffic (air and noise); and
  - No open space designated for recreation nearby.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

- The site within a proposed Green Wedge area for inclusion in the Local Development Plan and a flood risk area. Local Planning authorities have a duty to direct development away from such areas.

- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to
The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

<p>| Question: 2.1 | Site Name | Representation Text | Land at Colinda |
| Question: 2.2 | Location | Representation Text | Land at Colinda, Marshfield. |
| Question: 2.3 | Grid Reference | Representation Text | ST 259 823 |
| | | Council Response | 325930 182373 |
| Question: 2.4 | Site Area | Representation Text | 2 hectares |
| | | Council Response | 2.06ha |
| Question: 2.5 | Brief Description | Representation Text | The site is flat, open land, currently being used for agricultural purposes. |
| Question: 2.6 | Current Use | Representation Text | Agricultural |
| Question: 2.7 | Proposed Use(s) | Representation Text | Residential development. |
| Question: 3.1 | Brownfield? | Representation Text | No. |
| Question: 3.10 | Minerals Safeguarding Area? | Representation Text | No. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C3</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** Welsh Government comment: High Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. There is a high probability of BMV at this site. A pre revision survey found the area to be Grade 2. Soils (Salwick), climate and slope favourable.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable area of countryside and fringe Public Open Space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Public Open Space, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- **Representation Text:** Any vegetation such as trees and hedges to be retained to provide a valuable habitat for wildlife.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** The site is adjacent to the Archaeological Sensitive Area. Fairly Significant restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.2 Greenfield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Colinda, Marshfield.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Green C1
A flood risk assessment would be undertaken and any measures required taken.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:** No.
*Council Response:* Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Transport statement required to confirm capacity on networks. Dependent on development size.

**Council Response:**
- yes- marshfield rd
  - < 100 units will require transport assessment.
  - Visibility splays onto marshfield rd - 90 m achievable.
  - Potential to extend 20 mph limit across site.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** The site is set in a rural village and open space is easily accessible.

**Council Response:**
The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. The proposed development is approximately 750m from the nearest play provision so a LEAP would be required on-site to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, with off-site contributions for formal play facilities locally.
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### Proposed residential development on land at Colinda, Marshfield

**Question:** 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:** Public transport already in the area. The development would not improve/impact on the existing services.

**Question:** 4.2 Bus Route?

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Marshfield rd, site frontage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** 4.4 Railway Station?

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Newport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Marshfield rd - p.o shops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Cardiff Newport City Centre (employment) are easily accessible and there are local community facilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Links onto existing development to provide internal facilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Yes. Running along the site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** 4.9 Open Space?

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Informal open space can be found at the Meadows, Marshfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525.C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

Representation Text: Yes.  Marshfield Primary School

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

Representation Text: Located on outskirts of existing development. Services are therefore likely to be available. Enquiries would need to be made with the Statutory undertakers.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Representation Text: Yes.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated within the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site useage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

**Sewerage treatment**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Logical Extension?</td>
<td>In-fill development</td>
<td>the site is adjacent to the village boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Site Owner?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td>Yes. 7+ years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Development Boundary Change?</td>
<td>Yes. Currently allocated as countryside and green wedge.</td>
<td>The site is allocated as Countryside and Green Wedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Planning Application Refusals?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed residential development on land at Colinda, Marshfield

**Rep'n/Para/Policy**
1525.C3

**AccessnNo**
06/05/2009

**DateLodgd**
P

**Source**
P

**Type**
P

**Mode**
W

**Status**
M

**Status Modified**

**Summary**
Proposed residential development on land at Colinda, Marshfield

---

**Question:** Map Included?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

---

**Proposed residential development on land at Woodland Site, Ringland.**

**Rep'n/Para/Policy**
1525.C4

**AccessnNo**
06/05/2009

**DateLodgd**
P

**Source**
P

**Type**
P

**Mode**
W

**Status**
M

**Status Modified**

**Summary**
Proposed residential development on land at Woodland Site, Ringland.

---

**Site:** Woodland Site, Ringland

---

**SA Recommendation**

- Adjacent to cSINC (Ringland Way Marsh) and part within SINC (Hartridge Wood): Any potentially negative effects from development should be mitigated wherever possible.
- It is recommended that the site include a convenience store to reduce the need to travel for residents.
- It should be ensured that accessibility by public transport, including bus, walking and cycling, is convenient and reliable ahead of occupation on site.
- It should be ensured that enhancements to the sewerage network are ensured ahead of development to prevent potential pollution to land and water.
- It is recommended that the part of the site within the ASA is avoided, or any potential effects mitigated ahead of development.

**Overall Council Response**

This site is related to the rebuild of Hartridge Comprehensive as Llanwern High School, due to open April 2012, which is to serve existing and new development; also provides potential for a walking and cycling route from the school to Llanwern village through the new development now with planning permission.

**Site Name**

**Representation Text:** Woodland Site, Ringland.

**Location**

**Representation Text:** Land adjacent to Hartridge Comprehensive School, Ringland.

**Grid Reference**

**Representation Text:** ST 359 879

**Council Response:** 335942 187996

**Site Area**

**Representation Text:** 8 hectares

**Council Response:** 7.8ha
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Brief Description</td>
<td>1525.C4</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly sloping and predominantly grassland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Current Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant grassed area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Brownfield?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Agricultural Land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Welsh Government comment: Much of this site is already developed. There are high FCD's and poor soils which suggest the site is likely to be a mosaic of 3b and 4. There are issues across the site indicating poor soil drainage. A pre revision survey adjacent to this site found a mosaic of grades 3b and 4b. Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The form of development proposed will protect the areas of existing woodland and keep ridgelines frf from development. Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable area of Public Open Space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Public Open Space, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent to Hartridge Wood,plus TPO potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Opportunity for enhancement - detailed site planning would cover this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16 Archaeology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Woodland Site, Ringland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>Greenfield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>Contaminated Land Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>Flood Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>Adjacent to Water Course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.6</th>
<th>Topography / Stability Problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.7</th>
<th>SSSI?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Council Response | Part of the site is within SINC Hartridge Wood |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.8</th>
<th>Protected Species?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Council Response | The baseline Ecological Assessment produced as part of the SPG provides information on species, habitats and ecological constraints. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>3.9</th>
<th>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Council Response | Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>Access to Highway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Council Response | New access road via Hartridge School or link to Cot Hill would be required. |
## Proposed residential development on land at Woodland Site, Ringland.

**New access road from Hartridge School replacement site required.**

**Potential for walking and cycling route from school to Llanwern village through new development there.**

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:** Improved access to the woodland.

**Council Response:**

The Llanwern Ward has a shortfall in play space of 1.52Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the immediate needs of the local young people, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population. It should be noted that there is evidence that the land is being used for off-road motor bike use. Whilst it is likely that this use has been without permission, should this land be developed this type of use is likely to transfer elsewhere and potentially to public open spaces and play spaces causing an increase in anti-social behaviour within the local ward areas. Currently there is no provision within the boundaries of the City for this sport although there is a great demand.

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:** New services would be required.

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:** Not known

**Council Response:** 700 metre

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:** Not known

**Council Response:** 10 - 1 hour frequency

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:** Newport Station

**Council Response:** Newport station

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:** Relatively close - Ringland and Always shops, Newport Retail Park

**Council Response:** ringland d.c 1.4km 
always d.c 1.2km 
Newport retail park 2km

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:** Local community facilities are limited and a full range of new facilities are expected to serve the Eastern Expansion area - see SPG. Opportunities exist to accommodate large scale new employment uses in the Eastern part of the released steelworks site.
Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C4</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- **Representation Text:** Opportunities for a network with links to the wider area would be considered.
- **Council Response:** on site provision & infrastructure

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** PROW 397/397/3

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- **Representation Text:** Hartridge wood is adjacent to the site.
- **Council Response:** Informal open space is located Sterndale Bennett Road, Ringland

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Hartridge Comprehensive School. Various primary schools.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- **Representation Text:** We would be prepared to consult with the community on the layout of the development on this site.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- **Representation Text:** There are currently no services available in this area. Enquiries would need to be made with the Statutory undertakers.
- **Welsh Water Comments**

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
- **Representation Text:** See 6.1 The sewerage system is at capacity in the area. Although solutions are being sought with the other Developers in the Eastern Expansion area with Welsh Water.
- **Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C4</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

**Water Supply**

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelwork’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

**Sewerage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

**Nash Waste Water Treatment Works**

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C4</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Woodland Site, Ringland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

*Representation Text:* Site has been allocated for residential development within the Eastern Expansion area.

*Council Response:* The site is located in close proximity to the settlement boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

*Representation Text:* Site has been allocated for residential development within the Eastern Expansion area.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. 1 - 3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Currently allocated as countryside in the UDP and allocated for residential development in the Eastern Expansion Area SPG

*Council Response:* the site is allocated as Countryside, Eastern Expansion Area and Environmental Space within the UDP.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodged Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
1525.C4 06/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Woodland Site, Ringland.

**Question: 8** Other Information?
**Representation Text:** Site is currently allocated for residential development in the Council's Eastern Expansion Area SPG. Site identified for disposal to support the redevelopment of Hartridge School.

**Question: 9** Map Included?
**Representation Text:** Yes.

Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodged Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
1525.C5 06/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Pencarn Lane, Duffryn

**Question: SA Recommendation**
**Council Response:** It is recommended that only the previously that only the previously developed sites are considered for development. Development in the ASA should be avoided where possible. Public open space should be provided as part of development, especially where development includes residential provision or employment. It should be ensured that there will be no net increase in surface water runoff as a result of development to reduce the increased risk of flooding through the development of the greenfield site, especially where this may include sensitive uses such as residential accommodation. It should be ensured that the mix of uses provided on site cover the full range of community services and facilities required within walking distance including those in Table 3.4.

**Question: Overall Council Response**
**Council Response:** The site forms part of the St Brides SSSI and is situated within Zone C1 of the TAN 15, DAM plans. The Environment Agency has also confirmed that its flood zone maps identify the site as being at risk from flooding. Allocation of the site for housing would therefore be contrary to national guidance.

The candidate site was considered as part of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Inquiry. In considering whether the site should be included in the UDP for housing development, the Inspector recommended that the site be deleted from the plan as it is within the St Brides SSSI and has flooding constraints (REF Inspector’s Report - R3.12). Circumstances have not changed since this recommendation was made.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations on a greenfield site cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.
### Question: 2.1 Site Name
- **Representation Text**: Land off Pencarn Lane
- **Council Response**: Land off Pencarn Lane, Duffryn

### Question: 2.2 Location
- **Representation Text**: Land off Pencarn Lane, Duffryn

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
- **Representation Text**: ST 294 842
- **Council Response**: ST 294 842

### Question: 2.4 Site Area
- **Representation Text**: 20 hectares
- **Council Response**: 19.69ha

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description
- **Representation Text**: A low lying level parcel of grassland.

### Question: 2.6 Current Use
- **Representation Text**: Grazing land.

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
- **Representation Text**: Residential development.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
- **Representation Text**: No.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
- **Representation Text**: No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
- **Representation Text**: Yes. Grazing land.
- **Council Response**: Area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area.

It is recommended that the site is not included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes.
### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:**
The area is well screened by vegetation and visibility of the site is restricted by the low levels and flatness of the surrounding area. Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues SSSI.

**Council Response:**

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
TPO potential

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**
Pockets of land which are unsuitable for development should be used to provide wildlife habitats. The requirements to provide ponds to control surface water run off is an opportunity to create distinctive new landscape features and establish the landscape character and setting for the development.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Major Restraining Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Green C1
A flood risk assessment would be undertaken and any measures required taken.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:**

---

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at Pencarn Lane, Duffryn

**Date Lodged:** 06/05/2009

**Status:** Late?

**Source:** P W MP

**Mode:** P W M

**Accession No.:** 1525.C5

**Status Modified:**

---

**Major Restraining Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.6</th>
<th>Topography / Stability Problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. - Various reens - Overhead electricity cables - 3 electricity pylons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.7</th>
<th>SSSI?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. St Brides SSSI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.8</th>
<th>Protected Species?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Several species occur on the site - up to date surveys would be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.9</th>
<th>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Listed building n/a Ancient monuments n/a historic park n/a conservation area n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Newport boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.1</th>
<th>Access to Highway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No. New infrastructure required - would comply with appropriate standards of design and construction, capacity, safety and amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>No. No access currently. Site would depend on construction of Duffryn Link Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.10</th>
<th>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the immediate needs of the local young people, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.11</th>
<th>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The existing bus service to Imperial Park and Celtic Springs could be extended to include the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.2</th>
<th>Bus Route?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>800m to Pencarn Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep’n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525.C5</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at Pencarn Lane, Duffryn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Frequent every 5 - 10 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>10 Min frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.4 Railway Station?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>4 miles - Newport Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>1.2km to site boundary - Asda and Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Asda Duffryn shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.6 Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The site is located only 2km from junction 28 on the M4 motorway - providing easy access to South Wales, Bristol and the West. The site is also in close proximity to Celtic Springs and Imperial Park. There is a community centre in Duffryn which is easily accessible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Potential link into Celtic Horizons Development at white avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.9 Open Space?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Walking distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Informal and Equipped open space at Celtic Horizon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.1 Schools?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Duffryn High School, St Josephs High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Pencarn Lane, Duffryn

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
Representation Text: We would be prepared to consult with the community on the layout of development of this site.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
Representation Text: There are no useable services presently available within the site. Enquiries would need to be made with the Statutory undertakers.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
Representation Text: Not known.

Council Response:

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C5</td>
<td>P W MP</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Pencarn Lane, Duffryn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** Site forms an extension of the Pencarn / Duffryn housing sites and is within an established housing and employment area.

**Council Response:** The site is within the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** The train line forms a potential natural boundary to the development.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. 4 - 6 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Council Response: The site is allocated in part as white land and part as a proposed school site in the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Pencarn Lane, Duffryn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 8** Other Information?

**Representation Text:**

- The site was previously included in the draft UDP (H1(43) South of Pencarn Reen, Duffryn) and work was undertaken as a West Newport Masterplan.

**Question: 9** Map Included?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C6</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential land on land at Court Crescent, Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 99/ Court Crescent, Bassaleg

**Question: 2.1** Site Name

**Representation Text:**

- Land at Court Crescent

**Question: 2.2** Location

---

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.3 Grid Reference | Representation Text: ST 275 866  
Council Response: 327569 186644 |
| 2.4 Site Area | Representation Text: 3.6 hectares  
Council Response: 3.65ha |
| 2.5 Brief Description | Representation Text: Part woodland and slightly sloping, mainly vacant grassed land. |
| 2.6 Current Use | Representation Text: Vacant land. |
| 2.7 Proposed Use(s) | Representation Text: Residential development. |
| 3.1 Brownfield? | Representation Text: No. |
Council Response: Welsh Government comment: Low probability of BMV. Slope will limit the best Grade to 3a in North of site whilst the southern half is non agricultural being wooded.  
Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. |
| 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion? | Representation Text: The area is well screened by vegetation and visibility of the site is restricted by the surrounding area.  
Council Response: Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Area within proposed SLA 7 Tredegar Park. Tree, |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C6</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential land on land at Court Crescent, Bassaleg

---

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Part is woodland which will be subject to a TPO. The intention would be to retain the woodland.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- **Representation Text:** Pockets of land which are unsuitable for development should be used to provide wildlife habitats and any vegetation such as trees and hedges to be retained to provide a valuable habitat for wildlife.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In essential setting of Tredegar Park (registered park). No known archaeological features. Restraint. The construction of residential dwellings in the area will compromise the essential setting of the registered historic park. However, area will be seen against the current background of the Bassaleg School and as a slight extension to it. The area could be allocated in LDP with proviso that the impact on the historic park could restrict development.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** 16/02/2012

---

*Ecological, PROW issues.*
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C6</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential land on land at Court Crescent, Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
Part of the site is within the SINC Court Wood

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- **Representation Text:**
  Yes. Potentially - a survey would be required.
- **Council Response:**
  There are species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
- **Representation Text:**
  No.
- **Council Response:**
  Listed building n/a
  Ancient monuments n/a
  Historic park n/a
  Conservation area n/a
  Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
- **Representation Text:**
  Yes. A transport statement would be required to confirm effect on Forge roundabout.
- **Council Response:**
  New infrastructure required - would comply with appropriate standards of design and construction, capacity, safety and amenity.
  Yes- Court Crescent
  T.A. to confirm impact on network esp large lane.
  Visibility splay achievable at Court Crescent.
  Single point of access possible.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
- **Council Response:**
  The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. Owing to the isolation of the site, the nearest play facility is 1.2Km walking distance from the site, therefore a LEAP would be required on-site to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, with off-site contributions for formal play facilities locally.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
- **Representation Text:**
  300m to site boundary
- **Council Response:**
  Large lane- 200m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
- **Representation Text:**
  Every 5 - 10 minutes
- **Council Response:**
  30 min
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C6</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed residential land on land at Court Crescent, Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
-Rogerstone Halt - approximately 2 miles.

**Council Response:** Newport

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
-700m to site boundary. 4 units including newsagents and pharmacy.

**Council Response:**
-Laurel Road - 640m.
-P.O, shop, takeaway, hairdressers.
-Good access to school.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
-As the site lies close to good transport links it is highly accessible to jobs and community services.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Council Response:**
The site has the national long distance cycle/walkway running through it
-Links to existing infrastructure
-NCN etc.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Council Response:**
Yes.
-PROW 393/11
-393/112

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Council Response:**
-Various within Bassaleg and Tredegar House and Park are within walking distance.

**Question: 4.10 Public Rights of Way?**

**Council Response:**
Informal and Equipped Open Space is located as land off Caerphilly Road

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.
-Primary Schools, Comprehensive School, community centres all in Bassaleg.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**
No.
Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Representation Text: Not known, although within close proximity to existing residential development so would assume services are available.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text: Yes. Unknown but assume yes due to proximity of existing developments.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: The site falls on the outskirts of Bassaleg and would be a logical extension.

Council Response: The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text: Could add pressure as site is currently outside the urban boundary and located within countryside. Although it is a logical extension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C6</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential land on land at Court Crescent, Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. 1 - 3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site is currently outside the urban boundary located within the countryside.

**Council Response:** The site is allocated as Countryside within the UDP.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Comprehensive Development of 66 Hectares of land to comprise residential uses, public open space, landscaping, Bassaleg bypass and related highways works.

- Refused at Committee
  - DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING HOUSING AND RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS
  - Refused at Committee
  - HOUSING AND ASSOCIATED USES INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS
  - Dismissed at Appeal
  - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (AFFECTING FOOTPATH NO.18) INCLUDING MEANS OF ACCESS TO SITE
  - Withdrawn

Planning history on adjacent sites:
- Construction of Bassaleg By-Pass – AND, appeal dismissed

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** No.
### Rep'n/Para/Policy | AccessnNo | DateLodgd | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified | Summary
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
1525.C6 | 06/05/2009 | P | P | W | M | | | | Proposed residential land on land at Court Crescent, Bassaleg

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

### Rep'n/Para/Policy | AccessnNo | DateLodgd | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified | Summary
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
1525.C7 | 06/05/2009 | P | P | W | M | | | | Proposed residential development on land at Oliphant Circle, Malpas

**Site:** 100/ Oliphant Circle

### Question: **SA Recommendation**

**Council Response:** Any public rights of way should be maintained and enhanced through development of the sites. One of the sites is a SINC (Sneyd Park Wood); TPOs on sites: Development on the site should seek to connect to and enhance the ecological value of the area. It is recommended that any development likely to harm the environmental designations or protected species should not be permitted. Listed buildings likely to be affected (setting): the design of development should ensure that this effect is not negative. Monmouthshire and Brecon Canal Conservation Area adjacent- walking and cycling routes to benefit from this asset should be enhanced. Any potential for the development of employment uses for the tourism industry should be encouraged (this should be explored prior to development for residential use to ensure that any potential isn’t lost).

### Question: **Overall Council Response**

**Council Response:** The site is a Greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Malpas. The site is designated as Countryside and Green Wedge. There is one listed building on site and is adjacent to a Conservation Area. The land has also been identified as an area of moderate to high value in the LANDMAP assessment. The site also has a number of Tree Preservation Orders.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.

Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8

It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated as Countryside and Green Wedge and that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation.
### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land at Oliphant Circle

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Land at Oliphant Circle, Malpas

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 296 915

**Council Response:** ST 329616 191447

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** 2.5 hectares

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** Level, grassed open space

### Question: 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:** Vacant open space

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:** Residential development

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:** No

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:** No

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:** No

**Welsh Government comment:** There is a low probability of their being BMV at this site. The high FCD's (233) will likely limit the grade although this depends on which of the soils that the site is bisected by predominates. A pre revision survey found the site to be a mixture of Grades 4 and 3c.

**Council Response:** Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/P:</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C7</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Oliphant Circle, Malpas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

The area is well screened by vegetation and visibility of the site is restricted by the surrounding area.

**Council Response:**

Countryside comments:

- Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and fringe Public Open Space.
- Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts.
- Area of moderate to High value in LANDMAP.
- Public Open Space, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13** Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes.
- No, not protected.

**Council Response:**

TPO 16/2004

TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14** Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**

- Pockets of land which are unsuitable for development should be used to provide wildlife habitats and any vegetation such as trees and hedges to be retained to provide a valuable habitat for wildlife.

**Question: 3.15** Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes.
- See above 3.14

**Question: 3.16** Archaeology?

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Council Response:**

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

**Question: 3.2** Greenfield?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes.

**Question: 3.3** Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 3.4** Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes.

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:**

- No.
### Question: 3.7 SSSI?
**Representation Text:** No.
**Council Response:** The site has a small section within the SINC Sneyd Park and is also adjacent to the SINC Monmouthshire Brecon Canal

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
**Representation Text:** A survey would be undertaken.

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
**Representation Text:** No.
**Council Response:**
- Listed building (1 listed building)
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area (adjacent to)

Within Newport boundary

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
**Representation Text:** Yes. Improvements works to roads would be required.
**Council Response:**
- Oliphant circle.
- Graham bell close

Oliphant circle is narrow with on street parking. Additional development would have to be assessed. Possible need for improvements. Currently unlikely to support additional traffic.

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Malpas Ward that has a shortfall in Formal Play of 8.51Ha and Equipped Play of 2.34Ha. The proposed development is currently on land classed as informal play space, which there is a surplus of 12.23Ha within the ward. The proximity of the proposed development to the Westfield Recreation Grounds and Penny Crescent Play Area means that a request for an off-site contribution to upgrade local facilities would be made.

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
**Representation Text:** 60m to site boundary
**Council Response:** Whittle drive 400-600m
Malpas rd 600m

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
**Representation Text:** Every 20 minutes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.4      | Railway Station?  
Representation Text: Newport Station - approximately 3 miles.  
Council Response: Newport 4.5km |
| 4.5      | Convenience Shop?  
Representation Text: 1.85km to site boundary, range of shops  
Council Response: malpas rd garage 700m blackett avenue 800m school on whittle drive 400m |
| 4.6      | Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?  
Representation Text: The site lies within an established development and has access to the city centre and local community facilities. |
| 4.7      | Walking and Cycling?  
Representation Text: Within walking distance of Monmouthshire Brecon Canal which affords walking/cycling routes.  
Council Response: flyways on existing highways. Development must provide infrastructure and improvements as required. |
| 4.8      | Public Rights of Way?  
Representation Text: Yes.  
Council Response: There are no PROW on site 398/10 OUTSIDE THE SITE , ALONG THE BOUNDARY |
| 4.9      | Open Space?  
Representation Text: Within walking distance.  
Council Response: The site is actually classed as Informal open space. Other pieces of informal open space are located as Trevithick and Penny Close. There is also equipped open space at Penny Close |
| 5.1      | Schools?  
Representation Text: Yes. The site is within walking distance of Malpas Court Primary School. |
| 5.2      | Community Engagement?  
Representation Text: No. |
| 5.4      | Loss of Recreational Facilities? |

16/02/2012
### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:**
Within residential estate. Therefore services should be available. Due to low level of site a pumped sewerage system may be required.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Council Response:**

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated within the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

**Nash Waste Water Treatment Works**

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C7</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**

Area of land located on outskirts of an existing established estate.

**Council Response:**

The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. 1-3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Currently outside the urban boundary, allocated as countryside / greenwedge.

**Council Response:**

the site is allocated as Countryside and Green Wedge in the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**

No.
## Question: Planning Application Refusals?

### Representation Text

**No.**

## Question: Planning Applications Pending?

### Representation Text

**No.**

## Question: Map Included?

### Representation Text

**Yes.**

## Question: SA Recommendation

### Council Response

- Adjacent to CSINC (Ringland Way Marsh) and part within SINC (Hartridge Wood): Any potentially negative effects from development should be mitigated wherever possible.
- It is recommended that the site include a convenience store to reduce the need to travel for residents.
- It should be ensured that accessibility by public transport, including bus, walking and cycling, is convenient and reliable ahead of occupation on site.
- It should be ensured that enhancements to the sewerage network are ensured ahead of development to prevent potential pollution to land and water.
- It is recommended that the part of the site within the ASA is avoided, or any potential effects mitigated ahead of development.

## Question: Overall Council Response

### Council Response

The site is allocated for residential use in the adopted East Newport Development Framework SPG, linked to the rebuilding of Hartridge Comprehensive (now Llanwern High School), currently under construction. Allocation for housing is therefore proposed.

## Question: Site Name

### Representation Text

- Land at Hartridge Farm Road

## Question: Location

### Representation Text

- Land at Hartridge Farm Road, Ringland.

## Question: Grid Reference

### Representation Text

- ST 351 877

### Council Response

- 385075 187698
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Hartridge Farm Road, Ringland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>9.8 hectares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>9.7ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Sloped, with some level areas predominantly overgrown grassed land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Use(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Residential Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brownfield?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Part of site previously developed, currently a road safety centre and small office on site - to be demolished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The area is well screened by vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trees and Hedgerows?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>TPO potential.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Pockets of land which are unsuitable for development should be used to provide wildlife habitats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodged</td>
<td>Late?</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status Modified</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed residential development on land at Hartridge Farm Road, Ringland

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

*Representation Text:* No.

*Council Response:* Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

*Representation Text:* No. Brownfield site

*Council Response:* Part of the site is greenfield.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. A survey would need to be undertaken.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Green C1

A flood risk assessment would be undertaken and any measures required taken.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

*Representation Text:* No.

*Council Response:* Site adjoins Ringland Way Marsh cSINC.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Potentially. Surveys would be required.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

*Representation Text:* No.
## Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at Hartridge Farm Road, Ringland

| Council Response: | Listed building n/a | Historic monuments n/a | Historic park n/a | Conservation area n/a | Within Newport boundary |

---

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Infrastructure within the site would comply with appropriate standards of design and construction, capacity, safety and amenity.

**Council Response:** yes

---

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Ringland Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.85Ha. The land west to the site is in the ownership of Newport City Council and it is proposed to develop this site into a park using off-site contributions from this development.

---

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:** Yes. The development of this site would bring on the need for public transport which is required in the area.

---

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:** Unknown.

**Council Response:** 200 metres to site boundary
750 metres to southern boundary

---

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:** Unknown

**Council Response:** 30 min service. Extended service reqd.

---

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:** Newport Station

**Council Response:** newport station

---

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:** Walking distance
Ringland District Centre
Always shops
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
<td>As the site lies within the Urban boundary jobs and community services are accessible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Walking and Cycling?</td>
<td>Opportunities for a network with links to the wider area would be considered.</td>
<td>on site provision links onto SDR cycle way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Public Rights of Way?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Ref: 405/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Open Space?</td>
<td>Open space in Ringland and Always. School playing fields adjacent to site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Schools?</td>
<td>Yes. Hartridge Comprehensive adjacent to site. Various primary schools on Ringland and Always.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Community Engagement?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Community Aspirations?</td>
<td>We would be prepared to consult with the community on the layout of the development of this site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?</td>
<td>Existing services available within the vicinity of the site. Enquiries would need to be made with the Statutory undertakers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:**

Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

We have advised previously of our position with respect to the Hartridge Farm Road Development, and appropriate planning conditions have been implemented to protect our position. The public sewerage system downstream of the development is hydraulically overloaded. As such a hydraulic modelling assessment of the network will need to be undertaken in order to clarify what works will be required to ensure the development can be accommodated without jeopardising the environment.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. Any upgrade of this asset will likely be considerably expensive. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phased and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representation Text:**

No.

### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representation Text:**

Site has been allocated for residential development within the Eastern Expansion area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Precedent Setting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Site Owned by Proposer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Site Owner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Interest in Adjoining Land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Development Boundary Change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Planning Application Refusals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at Hartridge Farm Road, Ringland.

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Council Response:** Site situated within the urban settlement and Eastern Expansion Area.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
- Site has been allocated for residential development within the Eastern Expansion area.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- Yes. 1 - 3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- Yes. Currently allocated as environmental space in the UDP and allocated for residential development in the Eastern Expansion area SPG.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- No.

**Council Response:** RETENTION OF SINGLE STOREY ANNEX BUILDING PROVIDING GYMNASIUM CHANGING ROOMS SHOWER AND OFFICE FACILITIES

93/0414 18/06/83 Granted with Conditions

Relevant planning history on adjacent sites:

99/0694 DEVELOPMENT OF DUAL CARRIAGeway DISTRIBUTOR ROAD BETWEEN PONT EBBW AND COLDRA ROUNDABOUTS. Granted with Conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525.C8</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed residential development on land at Hartridge Farm Road, Ringland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representative Text:**

Site is currently allocated for residential development in the Eastern Expansion area SPG.

Site identified for disposal to support the redevelopment of Hartridge School.

**Question: 9**  
**Map Included?**

*Representation Text: Yes.*
### Question 1: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
It is recommended that the site be developed for a mix of uses, to include residential and employment. Adjacent to watercourse and SINC: any potential effects should be mitigated - it is recommended that a network of ecological corridors is integrated into the design of the site.

### Question 2: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
The candidate site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of Rogerstone. It is recommended that the site is allocated in the Local Development Plan for a mixed use development comprising: B1, commercial, leisure, residential and community uses.

### Question 2.1: Site Name

**Representation Text:**
- Alcan Factory/Works

### Question 2.2: Location

**Representation Text:**
- Rogerstone, Newport

### Question 2.3: Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**
- 267878
- 326667 187973

### Question 2.4: Site Area

**Representation Text:**
- Not known

**Council Response:**
- 20.18

### Question 2.5: Brief Description

**Representation Text:**
- Potential brown fill site close to amenities.

### Question 2.6: Current Use

**Representation Text:**
- Factory/works

### Question 2.7: Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:**
- Residential development

---

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at the Alcan Factory, Rogerstone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1562.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed residential development on land at the Alcan Factory, Rogerstone.

**Question: 3.1** Brownfield?

Representation Text: Yes. Factory/works

**Question: 3.10** Minerals Safeguarding Area?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11** Agricultural Land?

Representation Text: No. Factory / works - Industrial.

**Question: 3.12** Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

Representation Text: A factory along side houses, a church, public library. Development would be less intrusive than factory with tall chimney.

Council Response: Countryside comments:
No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13** Trees and Hedgerows?

Representation Text: Don't know.

Council Response: No TPOs in effect for this site. TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14** Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

Representation Text: Houses to replace factory. Gardens, more trees.

**Question: 3.15** Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 3.16** Archaeology?

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area includes site of post-medieval tinplate works. Restraint. May require desk-based assessment prior to planning permission being granted. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

**Question: 3.2** Greenfield?

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.3** Contaminated Land Risk?

Representation Text: Yes. Industrial site that may be contaminated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1562.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at the Alcan Factory, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** Zone C1 flood risk

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Along side of River Ebbw.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**
  - Listed building n/a
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park n/a
  - conservation area n/a
  - Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Would support increased level of traffic.
- **Council Response:** no

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

- **Representation Text:** Probably no change.
- **Council Response:** The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

- **Representation Text:** Close to bus route, train station.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1562.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at the Alcan Factory, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** Alongside bus route.

**Council Response:** tregwelyn rd

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** 4

**Council Response:** 10 mins

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:** 1 1/2 miles

**Council Response:** rogerstone newport

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:** 1/4 mile Co op, Morrisons - 1 1/2 shops

**Council Response:** st johns crescent, shops p.o. hairdresser etc 300m

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:** Very accessible.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:** Close to main bus route. Close to cycle track from Newport.

**Council Response:** flyways on tregwelyn rd.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:** None on site itself. Possibly a footpath next to River but not sure.

**Council Response:** Restricted Byway adjacent along north west boundary. 406/5.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:** <1/4 mile.

**Council Response:** Formal RS1 - Cricket Ground adjacent to proposed development.
Formal RS2 - Tennis Courts adjacent to proposed development.
Formal RS3 - Recreation Ground within 100m of proposed development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1562.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed residential development on land at the Alcan Factory, Rogerstone.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

Representations Text: Yes. Rogerstone Primary, Bassaleg School, Risca Leisure Centre.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

Representations Text: No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

Representations Text: Central site close to all amenities.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Representations Text: No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

Representations Text: The services should all be present at the site.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

Representations Text: No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Representations Text: Yes.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**

---

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1562.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed residential development on land at the Alcan Factory, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

Representation Text: Factory/site earmarked for closure. Would create a brown-fill site available for more dwellings.

Council Response: The site is located within the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

Council Response: There are sites in the Rhiwderin area that are green field sites and included in UDP. Development of a close-by brown fill site is preferable.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

Representation Text: No. Owners not aware of submission.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

Representation Text: Don't know.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

Representation Text: Yes. 4 - 6 years of the start of the LDP.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

Representation Text: Don't know.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

Representation Text: Don't know.

Council Response: ERECTION OF A 60 FT. HIGH STACK TO EXIT THE FUMES AT HIGH LEVEL IN LINE WITH H.M.I.P. GUIDELINES FOR STACK DESIGN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1562.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed residential development on land at the Alcan Factory, Rogerstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94/0910 11/11/94 Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REPLACEMENT OF 4 NO 40M HIGH EXHAUST STACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/0338 04/05/01 Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROVISION OF SINGLE STOREY DEMOUNTABLE AMENITY BUILDING CONTAINING REST ROOM LOCKER ROOM OFFICE TOILET AND SHOWER ROOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98/0211 20/04/98 Granted with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ERECTION OF CONTROL BUILDING AND TRANSFORMER PENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98/0345 22/05/98 Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTENSION TO EXISTING PRE HEAT BAY INCLUDING NEW PRE HEAT FURNACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91/0458 21/08/91 Granted with Conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant planning history on adjacent site:</td>
<td>ERECTION OF THREE DETACHED DWELLINGS (OUTLINE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90/0021. Granted with Conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.8** Planning Application Refusals?

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 7.9** Planning Applications Pending?

**Representation Text:**

Don't know.

**Question: 8** Other Information?

**Representation Text:**

I do not have all the information available to answer all these questions.

The Alcon factory / works in Rogerstone, Newport is set to close and redundancies announced. The site would offer a candidate brown-fill site for a number of dwellings.

**Question: 9** Map Included?

**Representation Text:**

Yes.
Overall Council Response

The site is a Greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Christchurch, and is designated as Countryside. The land has also been identified as an area of moderate to high value in the LANDMAP assessment.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.

Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8

It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated as Countryside and that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1596.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for development on land at Christchurch Road

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

Representation Text: Field - not been used for any purpose at present

**Council Response:**

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text: None

**Council Response:**

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

Representation Text: No.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text: No.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text: No.


**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Representation Text: The site overlooks the M4 and beyond to Ringland.


**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

Representation Text: Yes. Not known.

Council Response: There are no TPOs on site TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

Representation Text: By retaining some of the land for community use.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1596.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for development on land at Christchurch Road

**Representation Text:**

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Council Response:**

Yes. Access directly off Christchurch Road.

**Question 3.2**

Greenfield?

Yes.

**Question 3.3**

Contaminated Land Risk?

No.

**Question 3.4**

Flood Risk?

No.

**Question 3.5**

Adjacent to Water Course?

No.

**Question 3.6**

Topography / Stability Problems?

Yes. The land slopes away from Christchurch Road towards the M4 motorway.

**Question 3.7**

SSSI?

No. Not as far as we are aware - the field is directly opposite the L A Viewing Area on opposite side of the road.

**Question 3.8**

Protected Species?

No. Not as far as we are aware.

**Question 3.9**

Conservation Area or Listed Building?

No.

Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

**Question 4.1**

Access to Highway?

Yes. Access directly off Christchurch Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1596.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for development on land at Christchurch Road

Development proposals not confirmed but assume no capacity issues

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** Close proximity community site that would make access to open space easy.

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Caerleon Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 3.64Ha. Owing to the small size of this site an off-site contribution for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** Not applicable.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** Immediately adjacent

**Council Response:** adjacent to site

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** Min one per hour

**Council Response:** 30 min- 1hr frequency

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:** 3 miles approx.

**Council Response:** newport station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:** 1 mile - shops on Christchurch Road and Maindee areas.

**Council Response:** 900 metres- christchurch rd- p.o shop

950 metres- chepstow rd general store

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:** Close proximity to M4.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:** Good local walks/parklands etc.

**Council Response:** on site facilities
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1596.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for development on land at Christchurch Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- **Representation Text:** 10 metres
- **Council Response:** Formal open space can be found at Christchurch playing fields

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Good local schools - Caerleon/St Julians/Hartridge

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

- **Representation Text:** Position of the site should not impact on the local community

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

- **Representation Text:** All services are available in the area of the site.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. There is a bungalow next to the field.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we...
may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**

. The area adjacent to the M4 on the Chepstow road site has already been developed.

**Council Response:**

The site is located outside the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

. Not known.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1596.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for development on land at Christchurch Road

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- Representation Text: No. Not as far as we are aware.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: The site is currently allocated as Countryside

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
- Representation Text: Yes.
### SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

- It should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted.
- The area of woodland TPO (mixed deciduous) should be retained and linkages to the wider ecological system maintained.
- It is recommended that development leads to the enhancement of green infrastructure, and as such, this should be designed into the allocation.
- Any potential contamination on the previously developed portion of the site should be investigated and remediated where necessary ahead of development.
- If development is to proceed it should be proved ahead of development that no negative effects on the watercourse will arise as a result.
- Site is sensitive development in a known flood risk area. Subject to the revisions to TAN 15, it should be ensured that development will not increase the risk of flooding to people or property subject to advice from the EA.
- Site contains a listed building: it is recommended that the setting and value of the listed building are enhanced through the development of the site.

### Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

The provision of a Sustrans cycle route has been agreed as part of the S106 Agreement relating to planning permission 03/1763. The exact route is yet to be approved. The Local Development Plan will allocate a proposed cycle route based on recent discussions with Sustrans (4th August 2011 meeting). This route may be subject to change as part of the detailed planning application stage or discussions with Sustrans.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** New Tredegar Park Golf Course

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Adjacent to Forge Lane

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** 281 864

**Council Response:** 326667 186523

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** 3

**Council Response:** 1.61Ha

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** Disused Golf Course - Grass land
### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1602.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed cycle path on land adjacent to Forge Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question: 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:** Disused Golf course - grass land access via footpath.

#### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:** Cycle path (National cycle Route 4)

#### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:** It would allow the public better access to the countryside (including disabled access).

**Council Response:** Countryside comments: Historic Tramway – listed structure

#### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Trees that are protected are unknown. However the proposed development would not include removal of any trees.

**Council Response:** TPO 01/2006 mixed deciduous woodland. This application comprises a cycle lane crossing an area of such woodland. TPO 1 of 2006 protected woodland.

#### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:** There would be very little change to the current biodiversity.

#### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

#### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Part of Park to Tredegar House. Restraint. May require desk-based assessment prior to planning permission being granted. No reason for not allocating in LDP

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1602.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed cycle path on land adjacent to Forge Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- Representation Text: Yes. Proposal for a cycle path will have no effect on flooding - surface of path to be sealed to prevent water damage.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- Representation Text: Yes

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- Representation Text: No. Not for cycle route development.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: None on proposed site.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: There is a species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: Listed building n/a
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park n/a
  - conservation area n/a
  - Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
- Representation Text: Yes. However proposal would reduce current surrounding traffic levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1602.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23/04/2009</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed cycle path on land adjacent to Forge Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:** Yes

**No objection in principle**

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

*Representation Text:* Cycle paths make a positive contribution to the physical activity agenda within Wales. In addition they promote the use of active travel and taking cars off the road. The exact route configuration will need to be determined as future sports pitch layout will need to be identified with partners before planning approval in order to prevent the wasteful use of limited financial resources.

**Council Response:**

*This is what the proposed development will achieve.*

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

*Representation Text:* Provides a sustainable transport route and will be a vital part of national cycle route 4 (NCN).

**Council Response:**

*This provides a sustainable transport route and will be a vital part of national cycle route 4 (NCN).*

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

*Representation Text:* 0

**Council Response:**

*No objection*

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

*Representation Text:* Every 30 mins

**Council Response:**

*No objection*

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

*Representation Text:* 2.5 miles

**Council Response:**

*No objection*

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

*Representation Text:* 0.3 miles

**Council Response:**

*No objection*

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

*Representation Text:* This will provide a sustainable transport link to enable users from Bassaleg/Rogerstone area to access Newport Centre, Docks and Celtic Lake areas.

**Council Response:**

*This will provide a sustainable transport link to enable users from Bassaleg/Rogerstone area to access Newport Centre, Docks and Celtic Lake areas.*

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

*Representation Text:* By building a cycle route.

**Council Response:**

*No objection*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AcceptedNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1602.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed cycle path on land adjacent to Forge Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. See plan.
- **Council Response:** PROW 393/11 and 393/12
  - 393/119 & 121

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- **Representation Text:** It is open space.
- **Council Response:** Formal and equipped space at Tredegar Park Sports Ground which is adjacent.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Bassaleg Comp.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- **Representation Text:** It would give then improved access to the countryside as well as linking to the NCN.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- **Representation Text:** Unknown - not required for the development.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off
Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.4</th>
<th>Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.5</th>
<th>Logical Extension?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>It would complete a missing section of the NCN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The site is within the settlement boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.6</th>
<th>Precedent Setting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>None - However it will provide a sustainable transport link.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.1</th>
<th>Site Owned by Proposer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No. Not in ownership Owner not informed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.2</th>
<th>Site Owner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No. Interest is to provide the missing link in NCN route 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.3</th>
<th>Interest in Adjoining Land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.4</th>
<th>Restrictive Covenants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.5</th>
<th>Realistic Timescale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1602.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Summary: Proposed cycle path on land adjacent to Forge Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**

No. Currently environmental space.

**Council Response:**

The site is currently allocated as environmental space within the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**

unknown.

**Council Response:**

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE) AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATH 393/121 & 393/119

00/0980 11/12/00 Refused

CONSULTATIONS

NEIGHBOURS, SITE AND PRESS NOTICE: 26 - 38 (even) Park View, 23 - 31 (odd) Forge Lane, Bassaleg Ambulance Station and Whitehead Sports Club. Fifteen responses have been received one of which is signed by seven local residents. These raise objections to the proposal on the following grounds, loss of Environmental Space/open area, loss of flora and fauna, particularly mature trees, site floods, increase land levels would cause flooding elsewhere, main road currently subject to flooding, access located on dangerous land close to major road junction, access located close to ambulance station access, increased noise, pollution and congestion caused by traffic generated by proposal, increased heavy goods vehicles during constructional works, insufficient school places available, and application site includes land not in developers ownership.

RAILTRACK: No objections in principle but request imposition of conditions relating to security fencing to railway line, no lowering of land levels or excavations adjacent to railway embankment and noise other issues relating to layout and landscaping that may impact on the maintenance of the railway track.

CADW: Land is adjacent to Tredegar Park which is on Register of Parks and Gardens in Wales, Grade II.

GLAMORGAN-GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: Likely to be mediaeval features within area and in line with Planning Guidance (Wales) Planning Policy First Revision 1999 requests archaeological evaluation to be undertaken prior to determination of the application.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Objects to proposal as site falls within flood plain and proposal would be contrary to Government Guidance and Environment Agency Policy in respect to both flood risk and loss of landscape, conservation and amenity value.

SUSTRANS: Welcome inclusion of shared cyclist/pedestrian paths and suggest further provisions to improve cycle access.

COUNCILLORS McKIM AND CORNELIUS have been informed of the application.

HEAD OF EDUCATION: Schools in the area are operating at capacity and any additional demand would require increasing their capacity. As this is the case a financial contribution would be appropriate.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION: Given the proximity of the railway and the M4 a noise assessment will be required.

CREATION OF NEW JUNCTION FOR VEHICULAR ACCESS IN RELATION TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED RESIDENTIAL SCHEME 09/0097

GRAIG COMMUNITY COUNCIL: The Community Council reiterates all its previous comments (strongly objects to the proposed development as there is insufficient information to make a realistic and considered assessment; the application should be referred to the Environment Agency; application is in a Greenfield area which occupies part of the floodplain; question whether access meets highway regulations; consider that previous concerns to earlier application remain; development should be on brownfield land to the east of Newport and increased traffic generation causing gridlock especially with other developments in the area. However, should planning permission be granted a Section 106 agreement should be included for planning gain.

DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING LOCAL CENTRE AND PRIMARY SCHOOL INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS

93/0206 25/02/94 Refused

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, FLOOD ALLEVIATION WORKS AND ASSOCIATED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY 393/120 AND 393/121 (REVISED ACCESS DETAILS) (OUTLINE)

03/1763 02/02/05 Refused

16/02/2012 Page 569 of 968
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: There has been a substantial amount of correspondence with the Environment Agency regarding this application, but in their last two responses dated 4 and 20 January 2005, they comment that the site lies within Zone C2 as defined by the Development Advice Maps referred to in TAN 15 - Development and Flood Risk. The Environment Agency draw attention to paragraph 6.2 of the TAN which states that new development should be directed away from Zone C and towards suitable land in Zone A or B where flooding will be less of an issue. Highly vulnerable development should not be permitted in Zone C2, although other new developments should only be permitted if it can be justified in that location. The Agency, therefore, recommends refusal of this application.

GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: Object to the proposal but would also like to raise a number of issues with regards to the proposed development. The site is located on the floodplain and it is understood that the Environment Agency have objected to this development. The site is not allocated for development in the Deposit Unitary Development Plan (Second Proposed Changes). Note that the developers propose a new road through a biologically sensitive site. Although they have no records, the river is likely to be an important corridor for wildlife, and, therefore, need to take into account possible presence of protected species such as bats and otters. There is also the issue of storm water drainage to be considered.

The submitted information accompanying the application indicates that there is an area of "Existing Significant Vegetation" located in the western edge of the site which could provide habitat for protected species such as otters, bats, dormice and badgers. The proposal to create an area of public open space immediately adjacent to this could result in disturbance to what is now a relatively undisturbed area.

The local authority must also satisfy itself that there is sufficient information provided with the Environmental Statement to adequately assess the environmental effects of the proposal.

GWENT POLICE: Concerns regarding traffic approaching the new junction from Caerphilly Road Roundabout and also high increase in vehicle movements along this road which would be generated by the development. Already one set of lights at Pye Corner and the addition of a second set could cause traffic to build back which could result in shunt-type road traffic collisions. It is, therefore, imperative that the new lights are coordinated with existing traffic lights and additional warning signage erected. Would request that the development incorporates facilities for youths of the area.

CAMPAIGN FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL WALES: Object to the proposed development as it is not in accordance with the Deposit Unitary Development Plan (Second Proposed Changes) and a failure to adhere to the Plan would set a precedent for further development; the traffic generation will cause major congestion especially when the commutative effect of other schemes is taken into account and there may be significant environmental impacts as a result of building on the floodplain.

GRAIG COMMUNITY COUNCIL: Strongly object to the proposed development as there is insufficient information to make a realistic and considered assessment; the application should be dismissed and the appeal be granted. All development should be on brownfield land to the east of Newport and increased traffic generation causing gridlock especially with other developments in the area. However, should planning permission be granted a Section 106 Agreement should be included for planning gain.

FLOOD ALLEVIATION WORKS AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATH NO. 393/121
02/0140 29/05/03 Refused
COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: The Environmental Statement confirms that signs of otters have been found on the river. The proposal will involve modification to sections of the bank of the river and in order to avoid disturbance to otters there is the need for a buffer zone to be provided, for tree cover to be retained and strengthened where appropriate and work be undertaken outside sensitive times. With regard to bats, would recommend that any trees which may be suitable for roosting be surveyed before they are removed. The trees should be section felled outside the bat roosting season. Further surveys should be carried out to ascertain whether Great Crested Newts are present on site. Salmon are present in the river and the Environment Agency should be contacted regarding their requirements on these proposals. Badgers and their setts are given protection and concur with recommendations of the Environmental Statement that a survey of the site should be carried out. In close proximity to the proposed works is the Main Dock Feeder which is one of the main water supplies to the SSSI. There is, therefore, the need to retain a buffer zone between the proposed works and the Feeder.

CAMPAIGN FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL WALES: Object to the proposal on the grounds that there is insufficient detail concerning the effects of diverting flood water; the proposal is likely to be detrimental to local flora and fauna due to disturbance during construction and long term habitat changes; the need for flood alleviation does not seem to have been qualified; it seems this development is a precursor to residential development.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Object to the proposed development on the grounds that it is unlikely that formal consent of the Agency in accordance with the requirements of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the water Resources Act 1991 will be given for the works as they are contrary to the Agency's "Policy and Practice for the Protection of Floodplains". This policy is designed to secure and where necessary restore the effectiveness of floodplains for flood defence and environmental purposes. This is in accordance with Welsh Assembly Government Guidelines.

HOUSING AND ASSOCIATED USES INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS
94/0521 06/01/97 Dismissed at Appeal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1602.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.8</td>
<td>Planning Application Refusals?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.9</td>
<td>Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 8</td>
<td>Other Information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 9</td>
<td>Map Included?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

1623 Celtic Manor Resort
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Site: 9/ Celtic Manor

Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites

Question: Representation Texts

Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response: 5 listed buildings on site- the proposed development cites the relocation of 1. It is recommended that this does not occur, and development ensures no negative effects to its setting or fabric.
ASA: any potential effects on the archaeological sites should be investigated and mitigated prior to development.
Connections to access the site by walking and cycling should be ensured. As part of this, the PROW throughout the site should be enhanced to ensure that the facility is accessible for recreational use for all members of the community.
Potential for enhancement of biodiversity, air, water and noise quality should be enhanced throughout the site.
Traffic increases that may result from the development of the site should be reduced through the introduction of an extensive travel plan that includes the provision of direct public transport to the site that is appealing to all members of the community including those who are members of the golf club.

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: A masterplan approach is sought, whereby any proposals will have to demonstrate that they are in conformity with an overall concept. Residential development will not be appropriate, nor any other built development not directly related to the use in question.

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Celtic Manor Resort

Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: Coldra Woods
The Usk Valley
NP18 1HQ

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Representation Text: 336142
191009

Question: 2.4 Site Area

Representation Text: 410
Council Response: 587.5ha

Question: 2.5 Brief Description

16/02/2012
### Question: 2.6 Current Use
**Representation Text:**
The Resort provides sports, leisure, specialist golf, conference, hotel and residential facilities.

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
**Representation Text:**
- Hotel; exhibition centre; residential use; staff accommodation; office use; conference centre; specialist sports village; complementary recreational and cultural uses that could include a riverside restaurant, bar and associated accommodation; riverside path and cycleways; an arts and crafts centre; low-key outdoor recreational uses; transport and flood risk improvements; park and ride; golf facilities; open-air concerts and cultural opportunities and; relocation of the listed building.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
**Representation Text:**
Yes. Sports, leisure, specialist golf, conference, hotel and residential facilities.

**Council Response:**
The large proportion of the proposed development area is a greenfield site.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
**Representation Text:**
No. Not known to be.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
**Representation Text:**
A mixture of rolling hillside consisting of ancient and commercial woodland, parkland and existing/manmade waterways adjacent to the River Usk. The presence of the undulating land and natural features of the landscape will be utilised to minimise the built environment.

**Council Response:**
Countryside comments:
Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of mostly High value in LANDMAP Area. Part of area within SLA 4 River Usk Corridor. Ecological, PROW issues.

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
**Representation Text:**
Numerous.
- 11 X 4/80
- 1X 14/80
- 1X 72/80
- 24X 84/mon
- 13X 21/66
- TPO’d trees and TPO potential

**Council Response:**
Yes. Not known.
Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
Representation Text: The Resort constantly promotes and enhances biodiversity and particularly supports the use of indigenous species. The Resort employs specialist consultants regarding this matter.

Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
Representation Text: Yes. The previously submitted masterplan and associated documentation indicated the desire to utilise the riverfront area.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
Representation Text: Yes. The Resort employs specialist consultants to liaise with the Council regarding this matter.
Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area includes numerous scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings and parts are in an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Major Restraint. The impact of any development on designated sites will be a major factor in the determination of any application. Unless specific proposals are produced these impact cannot be determined. Consequently unless specific proposals are put forward the area should not be allocated in LDP.

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
Representation Text: Not known.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
Representation Text: Yes. Parts are within a flood risk zone. Ongoing liaison with Environment Agency.
Council Response: The northern section of the site is within Zone C2 flood risk

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.7 SSSI?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: SINC Coldra Wood Afon Llwyd Grasslands Bulmore Road Fields Little Bulmore Woods
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**Summary:** Candidate site for mixed use development on Celtic Manor

- New Wood West
- New Wood East
- Redland Pool Marsh
- Afon Llwyd

The site is adjacent to SSSI and SAC River Usk/Afon Wysg

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Door mice and slow worms have been found on site.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. There is a Listed Building adjacent to the 2010 Club House.

**Council Response:**

- Listed Buildings -
  - Bridge over Monmouthshire and Brecon Canal SE of Pentwyn
  - Little Bulmore
  - The Bell Inn PH
  - The Bulmore
  - Barn at Priory Farm

- Listed building (5within)
- Ancient monuments (within)
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Given the range of uses proposals and the size of the site, a response to this is considered premature. The Resort employs specialist consultants to assess highways matters.

**Council Response:**

yes

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

- **Representation Text:** As previously advised the site provides open space and recreational pathways are to be enhanced.

**Council Response:**

Newport has a shortfall in play space of 10.46Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population. The site provides key recreational and tourism opportunities with associated employment all of which contributes to the local economy of the City. The master plan would need to meet the requirements of TAN16 for the provision of Sport, Recreation and Open Space.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

16/02/2012
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**Summary:** Candidate site for mixed use development on Celtic Manor

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
- **Representation Text:** The nearest bus route is adjacent to the property on Chepstow Road.
- **Council Response:** 600 metres from hotel

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
- **Representation Text:** These start at 5am, finish at 10.30pm and run every 20 minutes.
- **Council Response:** 30 min service

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Representation Text:** Approximately 5 miles - Newport Railway Station.
- **Council Response:** Newport station

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** Approximately 450 metres away on Chepstow Road - two convenience shops plus a Tesco Metro.
- **Council Response:** 1km to general store on chepstow rd

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** The Resort is a provider of employment and accessible to its employees given the above.

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** There are existing cycleways and footpaths on site. The intention is to increase the number of these.
- **Council Response:** Cycle way crosses the Celtic Manor Resort Development Strategy Boundary from East to West

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**
  - 394/7
  - 389/4
  - 389/3
  - 389/5
  - 389/44
  - 389/3
  - 389/4
  - 389/3
### Question: 4.9 Open Space?

**Representation Text:**
- The Resort is usable open space.

**Council Response:**
No open space in immediate vicinity.

### Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:**
- No in immediate proximity.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:**
- No. The concept of the masterplan is to provide exactly this engagement and discussion.

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:**
- Dependant on the aspirations. The Resort keenly works with schools and other community bodies on specific projects.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:**
- No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:**
- Existing.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:**
- No. Each will be assessed on their own merits.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:**
- This is unknown and will need to be reviewed dependant on the scale and nature of the proposals. The Resort continues to work with Welsh Water and other parties in order to safeguard the current and future plans for the Resort.

**Council Response:**

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the
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environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

---

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** The Resort currently exists and the proposed uses are to complement the existing facilities.

**Council Response:** The site is outside the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
| Question: 7.1 | Site Owned by Proposer? | Representation Text: | No. |
| Question: 7.2 | Site Owner? | Representation Text: | Yes. The Resort owns the majority of the site and the boundary line that includes other ownership was devised from a practical perspective i.e. one outline rather than several areas to take account of different ownership. The Resort does not require ownership of land outwith its ownership to implement plans. |
| Question: 7.4 | Restrictive Covenants? | Representation Text: | No. |
| Question: 7.5 | Realistic Timescale? | Representation Text: | Yes. Dependant on the proposals, the enhancement to the Resort is intended to be implemented in early course and part of a long term strategy. |
| Council Response: | The site is allocated as Countryside within the UDP |
| Question: 7.7 | Unimplemented Planning Permissions? | Representation Text: | Yes. Application numbers unknown but appraisal is for apartments. |
| Council Response: | DEVELOPMENT OF SITE FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES 00/0281 25/10/00 Refused HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND TRANSPORTATION: Proposed access road unacceptable in terms of vertical and horizontal alignment, secondary access required and unenlarged turning head required. EXTENSION OF EXISTING GOLF COURSE ONTO AGRICULTURAL LAND AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW CLUBHOUSE, CAR PARK, ACCESS DRIVE AND FOOTBRIDGE OVER THE RIVER USK AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATHS 389/44A/44/53/54 01/0356 02/07/01 Granted with Conditions CAMPAIGN FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL WALES: Object to the proposal on the grounds:- - that the proposal affects a cSAC. - the proposal adversely affects an existing SSSI. - the proposal alters the integrity of the landscape and detracts from its essential rural character. Consider that the application should be determined by the Welsh Assembly as with the WRU proposal. Object to the proposal because the Llanhennock area is located in a Special Landscape Area identified in the Monmouthshire Borough Adopted Plan and development would break any such Policies in the Deposit Plan. The whole site is clearly visible from the... |
GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: Object to the proposal on the following grounds:-
- Need for the Development: There are existing facilities in place for the Welsh Open, and any improvement on this cannot be viewed as more important than the landscape and nature conservation interest. Responsible of the Council to grant consent on slight possibility that Ryder Cup would be held at this venue.
- Inadequacy of the Ecological Information. The Environmental Statement draws heavily on information from desk top studies which may be out of date and particular concern relates to lack of a site survey. Vegetation surveys were carried out at the wrong time of the year, and, therefore, need for further surveys to be undertaken at the appropriate time of the year.
- Insufficient time spent on bird surveys, and again carried out at the wrong time of the year. The invertebrate survey was undertaken at the wrong time of the year and several visits should be carried out to investigate all invertebrates present at site. No bat survey has been undertaken The mammal survey was carried out at the wrong time of the year, and note presence of dormice on site which are a protected species. Without more detailed information it is not possible to accurately assess the impact of the proposal, and it is unacceptable to comment that further studies will be undertaken at the appropriate time of the year.
- Impacts on the nature conservation value of the site. It is considered that the proposed development has serious implications for nature conservation value for the River Usk SSSI and SAC, for a number of protected species, biodiversity action plan priority habitats and species and many other semi natural habitats. No consideration has been given to the scale and magnitude of the impacts of the development on this resource. Of particular note is the threat to the grazing marsh which could suffer irreversible loss, but is a priority habitat. As well as the loss of significant areas of semi natural habitat, any remaining habitat will become fragmented and isolated. The alteration to the hydrology and intensive management will also have an adverse impact, together with disturbance to a wide range of species including badgers.
- Impact on the special landscape value of the local area. Consider that the development will result in a very significant change in character from a natural environment to a very artificial, intensively managed sporting facility with associated infrastructure. The proposal is also contrary to national and local policy.

ERECTION OF 5 DETACHED DWELLINGS
00/0759 23/08/00 Refused
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND TRANSPORTATION: Recommends refusal. Applicant does not show that a minimum distance of 3 x 120m to the left and 3 x distance to junction of Catash Road/Belmont Hill to the right when egressing the site is achievable and it their control.
COUNCILLORS COX, MACEY AND KIRKWOOD Have been notified. Councillor Kirkwood has objected to the proposal on the grounds that the proposal will have an unacceptable impact upon traffic flows on the strategic highway network, and both primary and secondary education facilities are operating at capacity.

CONSTRUCTION OF GOLF ACADEMY FACILITIES SITE TOGETHER WITH FLOODLIGHTING AND CAR PARKING
94/0714 07/10/94 Granted with Conditions

RENEWAL OF OUTLINE APPROVAL 91/0932/O - EXPANSION OF HOTEL CONFERENCE/EXHIBITION FACILITIES GOLF COURSE LEISURE FACILITIES EQUESTRIAN CENTRE AND 15 NEW DWELLINGS.
95/0151 05/05/95 Granted

FIRST PHASE OF DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 79 HOTEL APARTMENTS (VARYING SIZES OF 1, 2, AND 3 BEDROOM) WITH ASSOCIATED UNDERGROUND PARKING AND ACCESS ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE
02/0251 08/07/03 Granted with Conditions

PROVISION OF 3 NO FOOTBRIDGES AND 1 NO CULVERT BRIDGE AFFECTING PUBLIC FOOTPATH 389/53 CAERLEON
01/0427 25/05/01 Granted

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO CLUBHOUSE WITH FULL BASEMENT UNDER FOR USE AS LOCKER ROOMS & BALLSTORE
94/1040 13/01/95 Granted with Conditions

ERECTION OF 6NO. MIXED USE HOTEL / RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS PROVIDING 122 NO. UNITS
07/0386 09/06/08 Granted with Conditions
DWR CYMRU - WELSH WATER: No objection on the basis that private drainage facilities are being utilised. However the existing water network has insufficient capacity to provide guaranteed mains water supplies to the development. Extensive off site water mains will need to be laid to the site, for which financial contributions are required under Sections 40-41 of
the Water Industry Act 1991. The developer will need to bear the cost of a booster pump in order to ensure an adequate mains water supply. The development is also crossed by a trunk/distribution watermain. All development should be sited a minimum 3 metres from the centre line of the pipe.

GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: Object to the proposal due to inadequate ecological information about the proposed development site. Whilst there are no records on the site alert map, aerial photos show the area to be an area of grassland with scrub, woodland and ponds. Ecological surveys are required to assess the impact of the development on important habitats and/or species. Dormice, great crested newts and badgers may be present and there is a requirement for a breeding bird survey, amphibian survey and bat survey. This objection may be withdrawn if such surveys show minimum disturbance to wildlife or adequate mitigation.

ERECTION OF STABLE BUILDING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AND USE OF LAND FOR KEEPING HORSES
94/0706 16/09/94 Granted with Conditions

PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE OF BEER GARDEN TO PROVIDE GRAVEL BOULES PITCH AND CREATION OF CHILDRENS PLAY AREA
94/0609 16/09/94 Refused

LANDFILL TO RESTORE LAND TO AGRICULTURAL USE
01/0225 18/04/01 Refused

HEAD OF ENVIRONMENT: Objects on the basis of the information submitted. The site is located within a special landscape area and green wedge and lies adjacent to the Afon Llwyyd. It is also within the floodplain of the River Usk. The latter is a SSSI and cSAC. There are indications that protected species are present in and around the site and ecological information suggests that the site is a grassland of ecological importance. The applicant would need to provide a proper ecological assessment to evaluate.

GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: Object on basis of information submitted. It is unclear whether topsoil is to be removed. It is likely that archaeological features, possibly of national importance, may be present in the site. The application site will need to fully assessed so that the effect of the development upon the archaeological resource can be resolved prior to determination of the application.

CAERLEON AND DISTRICT CIVIC SOCIETY: Object in view of large scale of the project and impact upon local highway infrastructure. Also cite suspicions for proposed agricultural use.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: Objects to the proposal on the grounds that the site lies within an area of fluvial floodplain. The development would reduce the flood storage capacity of the floodplain and obstruct the passage of over land flood water, the cumulative effect of which would increase flood risk elsewhere. This is unacceptable.

ERECTION OF CLUBHOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND ANCILLARY WORKS
06/0164 17/05/06 Granted with Conditions

GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: Object on the grounds that whilst foul sewage will be processed via a treatment plant and reed bed system which will create additional wildlife habitat, surface water is being dealt with via interceptors to the existing water course. The existing water course is the River Usk which is a Special Area of Conservation which is protected by European legislation. Accordingly an appropriate assessment shall be undertaken to assess the implications on the protected site from surface water drainage. A mitigating condition on the planning application would be that surface drainage should go via a Suitable Urban Drainage System which would include the reed bed already proposed for the foul drainage in order to create additional natural wildlife habitat. The site is also adjacent to Little Bulmore Wood which is semi-natural woodland and should be protected from significant damage in accordance with Planning Policy Wales. Light and noise may disturb protected species such as bats and nesting birds and should be mitigated through the use of a 30m separation strip and compensatory planting.

CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND TO YARD AREA IN CONJUNCTION WITH GOLF COURSE MAINTENANCE BUILDING
93/0279 04/06/93 Granted

ACCESS ROAD TO SERVE HOUSING AREA
93/0443 02/07/93 Approved with Conditions

TO OPERATE A LANDFILL SITE FOR INERT MATERIALS ONLY AND SITE RESTORATION WORKS
93/0436 02/07/93 Refused

INSTALLATION OF SWIMMING POOL AND ERECTION OF SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURE
93/1146 18/03/94
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- **CONSTRUCTION OF 18 HOLE (PAR 63) GOLF COURSE ON LAND SOUTH OF CATSASH ROAD AND BOUNDED BY THE A449 INC DEMOLITION AND REPLACEMENT OF 2 DWELLINGS (NEAR DRAENLLWYNN) & DIVERSION OF FOOTPATH NOS 44 AND 45.**
  93/1189 14/03/94 Granted with Conditions

- **ERECITION OF 12M TELECOMMUNICATIONS COLUMN AND TWO EQUIPMENT CABINS**
  02/0871 16/08/02 Granted

- **PROPOSED WIDENING OF TRACK BETWEEN HOTEL AND GOLF CLUBHOUSE**
  04/1120 20/08/04 Granted with Conditions

- **ERECITION OF SINGLE STOREY GOLF CLUBHOUSE AND TOURNAMENT ADMINISTRATION BUILDING INCLUDING CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING**
  93/0781 08/10/93 Approved with Conditions

- **REDEVELOPMENT OF LEISURE COMPLEX**
  93/0562 29/10/93 Granted with Conditions

- **CONSTRUCTION OF PUTTING COURSE**
  93/1037 26/11/93 Approved with Conditions

- **INFILL LEVEL 2 UNDERCROFT TO CREATE TWO STOREY EXHIBITION HALL WITH ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS**
  04/0289 23/04/04 Granted with Conditions

- **REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO PROVIDE TOURIST ACCOMMODATION INCLUDING IMPROVED ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS**
  02/0494 19/07/02 Refused

- **HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION:** Objects to the proposed development unless a visibility splay of 2.4m x 215m and requires minimum parking spaces equal to 1 space per 14 sqm of dining area, 1 space per 3 non resident staff and 1 commercial vehicle space.

- **REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT**
  04/0530 28/05/04 Granted

- **REBUILDING AND REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING BUILDINGS TO FORM STABLES, BARN, IMPLEMENT SHED, MENAGE AND ANCILLARIES AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY 389/37**
  05/0324 02/11/05 Refused

- **HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION (STRUCTURAL ENGINEER):** Several of these buildings are not suitable for conversion and will need substantial rebuilding.

- **RE-ALIGNMENT OF ACCESS ROAD TO PROPOSED NEW GOLF CLUBHOUSE AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY 389/38 CAERLEON**
  04/1832 12/12/07 Granted with Conditions

- **PROVISION OF UNDERGROUND GAS MAIN**
  98/1241 05/01/99 Granted with Conditions

- **DEVELOPMENT OF CLASS B1 AND HOTEL WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING PERMISSION TO DEVELOP LAND WITHOUT COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITION 2 OF 1/17298**
  91/0853 01/11/91 Granted with Conditions

- **ERECITION OF A DETACHED INDOOR SWIMMING POOL BUILDING**
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**07/1145 28/02/2008** Granted with Conditions

**CREATION OF TWO NEW GOLF HOLES**
04/1882 21/01/05 Granted with Conditions

**ERECTION OF TWO STARTER HUTS**
05/0059 11/03/05 Granted with Conditions

**ERECTION OF THIRTEEN HOUSES (RENEWAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION 95/0865/VC)**
97/1207 25/02/98 Granted with Conditions

**NEW EXHIBITION CENTRE AND LECTURE THEATRE AND NEW MULTI LEVEL CAR PARK**
98/0004 25/02/98 Granted with Conditions

**PROPOSED HORSE RIDING CENTRE WITH ANCILLARY FACILITIES & STAFF ACCOMMODATION**
91/1344 12/02/92 Refused

**FORMATION OF SPECIAL EVENTS COACH PARK AND DROP OFF AREA FOR MAJOR EVENTS, AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY 389/38**
8/1155 11/02/09 Granted with Conditions

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: No objection subject to conditions which mitigate and compensate for the impacts of the scheme on protected species. The submitted report does not refer to dormice but a survey was undertaken on a nearby site in 2008 with positive results. Dormice are also known to be present in surrounding woodland and it should therefore be assumed that they are present on the application site. In such cases a development may only proceed under licence from the Welsh Assembly Government. The requirements of derogation should therefore be taken into account. Mitigation should be provided in respect of the effect of the development on grass snakes and nesting birds. The development should also comply with the report produced by EnvironPlus International Ltd.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (LANDSCAPING): Whilst the site is well screened along long and middle distance views from the north west and north east, the site is clearly visible from the Usk Valley Walk adjacent to the site and to the south east. Buffer plantation proposals to the north western and northern boundaries need to be provided and planting should also be introduced to the south eastern boundary abutting the Usk Valley Walk. Due to the rise in site levels and the short establishment period for the buffer prior to the Ryder Cup, plant stock sizes are to be carefully considered to ensure the coach park is adequately screened. Planting densities should also be carefully considered to promote height growth during the initial establishment period. The loss of the neutral grassland (local BAP) is classified as a minor adverse impact and should be mitigated through the provision of an alternative grassland area. Site levels need to be agreed prior to the commencement of works, along with details of surfacing for the coach park and pedestrian areas. Further details are also required in respect of the root Protection Area for the large single Oak in the centre of the site.

**INSTALLATION OF WATER STORAGE RESERVOIR FOR GOLF COURSE IRRIGATION**
92/0595 07/08/92 Granted with Conditions

**ERECTION OF PROPOSED GARAGE AND UTILITY ROOM**
92/0243 23/04/92 Granted with Conditions

**CHANGE OF USE FROM DOMESTIC DWELLING TO NURSING HOME PLUS TWO STOREY EXTENSION - BEDROOMS/BATHROOMS ETC.**
91/1388 03/07/92 Refused

**ERECTION OF TWO STOREY OFFICE BLOCK - CLASS B1 (APPROX 30 000 SQ FT)-REVISION OF PLANNING PERMISSION 90/0036/VC**
92/0075 27/03/92 Granted with Conditions

**CONSTRUCTION OF 18 HOLE GOLF COURSE (NO.3) AND ANCILLARY WORKS ON LAND BETWEEN CATSASH ROAD THE A445 AND THE RIVER USK**
95/1056 02/08/96 Granted with Conditions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1623.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for mixed use development on Celtic Manor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION OF UNDERGROUND SWIMMING POOL AT RECENTLY CONSTRUCTED CLUB HOUSE
95/0363 09/06/95 Granted with Conditions

INSTALLATION OF PACKAGE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT TO REPLACE DEFUNCT SEPTIC TANK
95/0392 03/07/95 Granted with Conditions.

INSTALLATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS APPARATUS
95/0511 17/07/95 Refused
In Basement.
CONSTRUCTION OF GAS INSPECTION CHAMBER TO ENABLE INTERNAL INSPECTION OF GAS TRANSMISSION PIPELINES
91/0151 05/04/91 Granted with Conditions.

ERECTION OF THIRTEEN HOUSES (RENEWAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION 91/1322/RM)
95/0865 08/12/95 Granted with Conditions

PROVISION OF THREE STOREY CAR PARK FOR HOTEL EXHIBITION CENTRE
97/0627 13/08/97 Granted with Conditions

CONSTRUCTION OF GAS GOVERNOR BUILDING  TELEMETRY KIOSK AND RADIO MAST REQUIRED TO BOOST AND CONTROL GAS PRESSURES TO THE ] NEWPORT EAST DISTRICT
91/0165 05/04/91 Granted with Conditions

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE)
99/0488 07/07/99 Refused
In Basement.

EXTEND EXISTING TOWER AND INSTALL DIGITAL RADIO ANTENNA AND AN EQUIPMENT CABIN AT GROUND LEVEL FOR BBC AND DIGITAL ONE
06/1130 21/07/06 Granted

DEVELOPMENT OF SITE BY THE ERECTION OF SIX  EXECUTIVE  DETACHED HOUSES WITH GARAGES
89/0018 06/10/1989 Refused

PROVISION OF 14 NO. TENNIS COURTS WITH PAVILION  FENCING  SEATING AND LIGHTING
97/0342 23/07/97 Granted with Conditions

EXPANSION OF HOTEL TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL BEDROOMS CONFERENCE/EXHIBITION FACILITIES  GOLF COURSE LEISURE FACILITIES EQUESTRIAN CENTRE AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING DWELLINGS AND FARM BUILDINGS WITH 15 NEW DWELLINGS.
91/0932 19/03/92 Granted with Conditions

REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT (AMENDED SCHEME)
04/1212 24/09/04 Granted

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (COUNTRYSIDE): Footpath 389/35, which passes along the track next to the plant would not be adversely affected by the proposal. Some provision should be made for potential damage to the surface of the track if it is to be used by vehicles. The kissing gate at the roadside has been replaced by a stile. This is not acceptable and the kissing gate should be re-instated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1623.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for mixed use development on Celtic Manor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

- No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

- Yes. Two live applications for coach parks for the Ryder Cup provision - application numbers unknown.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

- This submission requires to be considered in tandem with the other submission made by the Resort as part of the LDP process.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

- Yes.
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1631</th>
<th>Accent Newport Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rep'n/Para/Policy</strong></td>
<td>AccessNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1631.C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Use of St Mary's Institute as a Chartist Café, employment training centre, citizenship education centre and continuing use as a church hall.

---

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:** Candidate Site has been withdrawn

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** St Mary's Institute

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Stow Hill

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 311881

**Council Response:** 331053 188060

**Question:** 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** 1/4 acre approx.

**Council Response:** 0.02

**Question:** 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:** St. Mary's Institute was built in the latter part of 19th century and began life as an Infant School. It is now serves as a hall for the adjacent St Mary's Church.

**Question:** 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:** Church Hall

**Question:** 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:** Chartist café, Employment Training Centre, Citizenship Education Centre and continuing use as Church Hall & Social Club.

**Question:** 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question:** 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

---

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Use of St Mary's Institute as a Chartist Café, employment training centre, citizenship education centre and continuing use as a church hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
  - Representation Text: No.

- **Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
  - Representation Text: Stow Hill is recognised as a deprived area and has Communities First status. The Westgate Hotel next door is boarded up. Nearby are several derelict buildings. The development will not substantially alter the appearance of the building externally.
  - Council Response: Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

- **Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
  - Representation Text: No.

- **Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
  - Representation Text: Provision to be made for use of grey water systems.

- **Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
  - Representation Text: No.

- **Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
  - Representation Text: Yes. Newport Castle within 500m. The project will signpost other archaeological and heritage sites, encouraging tourist football.
  - Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Inside medieval town and included in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Restraint. Dependent on design may require archaeological evaluation prior to determination of planning consent. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

- **Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
  - Representation Text: No.

- **Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
  - Representation Text: No.

- **Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
  - Representation Text: No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?

- **Representation Text:** Yes. St. Mary's Institute grouped with the other buildings on the same site - St. Mary's Church and Presbytery, is Grade II listed. It is within the Stow Hill Conservation Area.

**Council Response:**
- St Mary's Catholic Infant School (St Mary's Institute) is a listed building.
- This site lies within a Conservation Area.

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Some internal accessibility issues exist.

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?

- **Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Stow Hill Ward that has a shortfall in Formal Play of 6.56Ha and Equipped Play of 0.92Ha. Should the site be used for residential purposes in the future owing to the size of the site and off-site contribution will be required for outdoor play facilities locally.

**Question: 4.2** Bus Route?

- **Representation Text:** 100m.

**Question: 4.3** Bus Frequency?

- **Representation Text:** Various.

**Question: 4.4** Railway Station?

- **Representation Text:** 300m.

**Question: 4.5** Convenience Shop?

- **Representation Text:** 20m.
Summary: Use of St Mary’s Institute as a Chartist Café, employment training centre, citizenship education centre and continuing use as a church hall.

Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
Representation Text: City Centre Location.

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
Representation Text: A companion Charterist Walk route would encourage walking.

Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 4.9 Open Space?
Representation Text: 200m Chapel Park
20m Westgate Square
Council Response: Open space in close proximity to the site includes St Mary Street and Talbot Lane

Question: 5.1 Schools?
Representation Text: Yes. St Mary’s Primary School within 2 miles.
St Woolos Primary School within 500m.
Maindee Primary School within 1 mile.

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
Representation Text: Yes. There has been some initial discussion of developments some time ago. Wider and more detailed discussion needs now to take place.

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
Representation Text: The trainees in the café, café visitors, tourists, students and volunteers workers will be new user groups. Existing user groups will continue and be encouraged to thrive.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
Representation Text: No. It is vital to develop the site in such a way that existing users are able to continue their activities and use as a church hall is preserved.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
Representation Text: All utilities are already on site.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
Representation Text: Yes. There may be some issues regarding the noise from building works occurring during church services. This can be accommodated by prior agreement with the contractors.
**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representations Text:**
Yes. Yes. The site has full utilities provision.

**Council Response:**

Welsh Water Comments

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development for sites 155.C2 and 155.C3. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

For sites 1631.C1, 1631.C2, 1631.C3, 1631.C4, 1631.C5 and 1631.C6 it is unlikely that we will have any objections to their inclusion within the development plan.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Use of St Mary's Institute as a Chartist Café, employment training centre, citizenship education centre and continuing use as a church hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. It is proposed to use part of the site as a café providing training and support to young adults with disabilities. The distance between the café and Westgate Chambers residential development is approximately 50m.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**
The site has a historic connection with the Charitists. Church charitable activity already includes young adults with disabilities but does not encompass training for work.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**
The development of this site should be seen as link with other Chartist-related projects such as the development of a Chartist Walk and the illumination and interpretation of the Westgate Square Sculptures.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**
No. St. Mary's Institute is owned by the Trustees of the Archdiocese of Cardiff who are aware of this submission.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**
No. Accent Newport Trust is based in St. Mary's Institute.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**
No. The Trustees of the Archdiocese of Cardiff own the site of St. Mary's Church and St. Mary's Presbytery.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. 1-3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
Relevant Planning History on adjacent site:

05/1279 RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION OF DISUSED OFFICE SPACE TO FORM 24NO. FLATS 170-173, COMMERCIAL STREET
### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?

**Representation Text:**

No.

### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

**Representation Text:**

No.

### Question: 8 Other Information?

**Representation Text:**

The proposal is to develop St. Mary's Institute to make provision for:

1. Chartist Café providing sheltered employment training for young adults with disabilities.
2. Chartist decoration / interpretation within the café aimed at tourists and other visitors.
3. Citizenship Education Centre based on Chartist heritage for schools/students etc.
4. Continuing use by the community/church as a meeting place.
5. Associated fundraising provision.
6. Provide a focus for heritage tourism and increase footfall in the city centre.
7. Encourage economic tourism by signposting other heritage and archaeological sites.

The facility will offer training to young adults with disability in all the practical and inter-personal skills associated with preparing and serving light meals. Both "Fair Trade" products and local sourcing will be features of the menu. The cafes décor will offer interpretation of the Chartist Heritage story and is likely to attract both passing trade and tourists. School and University students will benefit form use of the Citizenship Education Area on the first floor where elements from the Chartists story will be taken to illuminate citizenship issues relevant to life in today's society. The education area has the potential to draw school trips from far and wide. The sustainability of the Chartist Café and Citizenship Education Centre will be assisted by the incorporation of facilities for volunteers to engage in fundraising activities. These proposals must include provision to allow existing users including church groups, community and social club groups, space elsewhere within the building to continue their current activities.

### Question: 9 Map Included?

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

### Summary

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Use of St Mary's Institute as a Chartist Café, employment training centre, citizenship education centre and continuing use as a church hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Demarcation of Stow Hill as Chartist Heritage site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 62/ Stow Hill

---

**97/1044 LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR REDEVELOPMENT AND PARTIAL DEMOLITION INCLUDING CONVERSION AND EXTENSION TO CREATE 3960M2 OF CLASS A1 RETAIL AND CLASS A3 RETAIL/LEISURE (DUPLICATE APPLICATION) WESTGATE HOTEL GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS**

---

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Demarcation of Stow Hill as Chartist Heritage site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** Overall Council Response

*Council Response:* The proposal can be implemented as appropriate

**Question: 2.1** Site Name

*Representation Text:* Demarcation of Stow Hill as Chartist Heritage site.

**Question: 2.2** Location

*Representation Text:* All Stow Hill and Clifton Road - starting at St. Woolos Hospital (Workhouse end) and ending at Westgate Square.

**Question: 2.3** Grid Reference

*Representation Text:* From 305875 to 311882

*Council Response:* 330895 188114

**Question: 2.5** Brief Description

*Representation Text:* Public highway with pavements at various levels above the highway.

**Question: 2.6** Current Use

*Representation Text:* Public Highway.

**Question: 2.7** Proposed Use(s)

*Representation Text:* Public Highway with specific demarcation using appropriate street furniture to highlight the Chartist heritage of the area and the promotion of a Chartist Walk route.

**Question: 3.10** Minerals Safeguarding Area?

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 3.11** Agricultural Land?

*Representation Text:* Yes.

**Question: 3.12** Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

*Representation Text:* Stow Hill is recognised as a deprived area and has been granted Communities First status. The Westgate Hotel and other nearby buildings are boarded up. Several are derelict. A project to demarcate the area as of Chartist heritage would enhance the appearance of the area.

*Council Response:* Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. Details may require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Yes
- **Council Response:** No TPOs at this site. Conservation Area. TPO’d trees present.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

- **Representation Text:** The re-planting trees along this route would benefit its appearance and enhance biodiversity.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. See above

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Newport Castle within 500m of Westgate Square.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Inside medieval town and included in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Restraint. Dependent on design may require archaeological evaluation prior to determination of planning consent. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
| Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 1631.C2                                          | 06/05/2009                    | P                  | P               | W               | M               |                 | Summary: Demarcation of Stow Hill as Chartist Heritage site. |

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

Yes. Stow Hill is a Conservation Area.

**Council Response:**

The route is within a conservation area and has the following listed buildings:
- Parish Church of St. Dubritius.
- 61 The Friars
- No.s 95-101 odd no.s
- No.s 95-1-1 odd no.s as above.
- Westgate Buildings

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Council Response:**

No Objection

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

People using this walk would be encouraged to use the nearby parks which could be included in information about the walk.

**Council Response:**

Heritage walks contribute to the physical activity agenda which is at the forefront of WAG policy.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

Information about bus routes would be included in walk advertising.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**

Various buses use the route

**Council Response:**

No objection

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**

Various

**Council Response:**

No objection

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**

300m from Westage Square

**Council Response:**

No objection

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**

Several en route
**Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**Stage=C; not submitted Later**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Demarcation of Stow Hill as Chartist Heritage site.

**Council Response:** No objection

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
- City Centre Location.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**
- A Chartist Walk route would promote walking and would be useful for signposting other walks in the area.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:**
- Cathedral Square - Clifton Park
- Chapel Park - Westgate Square
- St Mary Street - Within 50m of route
- Talbot Lane - Adjacent to route
- Clifton Place - Adjacent to route
- Slifton Place - Adjacent to route

**Council Response:**

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. St Woolos Primary School en route.
- Maindee Primary School within 1 mile.
- Clytha and St Mary's Primary within 2 miles

**Council Response:**

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. There has been ongoing discussion of this proposal in the Communities First Partnership Board. Wider - more detailed discussion now needs to take place.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**
- Promoting the heritage of the locality would be a boost to residents by enhancing the appearance of the area. Tourists footfall would be encouraged in the city centre.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**
- No.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:**
- No.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**
- Welsh Water Comments

16/02/2012
From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development for sites 155.C2 and 155.C3. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

For sites 1631.C1, 1631.C2, 1631.C3, 1631.C4, 1631.C5 and 1631.C6 it is unlikely that we will have any objections to their inclusion within the development plan.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.
1631.C2
06/05/2009  P  P  W  M
Summary: Demarcation of Stow Hill as Chartist Heritage site.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
Representation Text: Stow Hill has a historic connection with the Chartists and demarcation of this heritage is aimed to increase footfall and economic activity in the city centre.
Council Response: The site is within the settlement boundary.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
Representation Text: The development of this site should be seen as a link with other Chartist-related projects such as the development of a Employment Training Chartist Café and Citizenship centre in St. Mary’s Institute, and the illumination and interpretation of the Westgate Square Sculptures as well as to Chartist and other heritage sites in Greater Gwent and beyond.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
Representation Text: No. NCC owned.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
Representation Text: No. Accent Newport Trust is interested in promoting the city’s heritage.

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
Representation Text: No. An interest in developing an Employment Training Chartist Café and Citizenship Centre in St Mary’s Institute (see proposal 1631.J1).

Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
Council Response:
CONSTRUCTION OF SHOPPING CENTRE INCORPORATING 353 CAR PARKING SPACES
89/0334 Granted with conditions 23/10/1989

REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE FOR SHOPPING CENTRE DEVELOPMENT WITH ANCILLARY WORKS INCLUDING MULTI-STOREY CAR PARK
99/0955 20/01/2000 Granted with conditions

CONSTRUCTION OF SHOPPING CENTRE INCORPORATING 315 CAR PARKING SPACES - REVISED APPLICATION
90/0598 10/08/1990 Granted wit conditions

Applications on Adjoining sites
07/0797. RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION (DESIGN, EXTERNAL APPEARANCE AND LANDSCAPING) OF OUTLINE PP 05/1474 - MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT INC. RETAIL, LEISURE, HOTEL, RESIDENTIAL WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, MODIFIED BUS STATION AND LANDSCAPING INCORPORATING AMENDMENTS TO RM APPLICATION 07/0112. Granted with conditions. APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. 17/09/2009.

07/1014. ERECTION OF HOTEL – Granted with conditions. 17/09/2009
**Question: 8 Other Information?**

Representation Text:

1) Demarcate the length of Stow Hill from St. Woolos Hospital to Westgate Square (and including Clifton Road) as of Chartist heritage by using appropriate lamppost banners and flags, benches, pavement plaques and other pavement features (e.g. Lower Docks Street pavement interpretation).

2) Promotion of a Chartist Walk route by:
   a) Publicity leaflet identifying the route of a Chartist Walk and encouraging individuals and groups to walk the route, as a first step towards
   b) Interpretation boards marking the route of a Chartist Walk at the following sites - St Woolos Hospitals (former Workhouse building), St Woolos Cathedral, Friars House, Clifton Park, various sites on Stow Hill, Westgate Square. The Chartist Walk route could be extended to include High Street, John Frost, Newport Museum and other places in the city centre.
   Additional audio-visual material accessible via mobile phone could be available at each interpretation board along the route. Pavement plaques useful for "brass rubbing" activities to be included where safe to do so.
   C) Employment of Green Badge Guides to conduct heritage walks in the Stow Hill/City Centre area.

3) Receive the mutual benefits of promoting other heritage in the area.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary**

**1631.C2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Summary: Demarcation of Stow Hill as Chartist Heritage site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

08/0303. APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS (DESIGN, EXTERNAL APPEARANCE AND LANDSCAPING) OF OUTLINE PERMITION 05/1474 FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING RETAIL, LEISURE, HOTEL AND RESIDENTIAL CLASSES WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, MODIFIED BUS STATION AND LANDSCAPING INCORPORATING AMENDMENTS TO RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATIONS 07/0112 AND 07/0927. Approved with conditions. 26/03/2008.

07/0112. APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS (DESIGN, EXTERNAL APPEARANCE AND LANDSCAPING) OF OUTLINE PLANNING PERMITION 05/1474 FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING RETAIL, LEISURE, HOTEL AND RESIDENTIAL CLASSES WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, MODIFIED BUS STATION AND LANDSCAPING. Granted with conditions. 13/06/2007

08/0683. ERECTION OF HOTEL. Granted with conditions. 09/07/2009.

05/1474. MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING RETAIL, LEISURE, HOTEL AND RESIDENTIAL CLASSES WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, MODIFIED BUS STATION AND LANDSCAPING. Granted with conditions. 02/06/2006.

08/0201. MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING RETAIL, LEISURE, HOTEL AND RESIDENTIAL CLASSES WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, MODIFIED BUS STATION AND LANDSCAPING (INCORPORATING AMENDMENTS TO PLANNING PERMITION 05/1474). Granted with conditions. 26/03/2008.

**Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary**

**1631.C3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Summary: No longer pursuing Westgate Hotel as a proposed Chartist citizenship centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: 70/ Westgate Hotel
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

Rep’n/Para/Policy  AccessnNo  DateLodgd  Late?  Source  Type  Mode  Status  Status Modified  Summary
1631.C3  06/05/2009  P  P  W  M  Summary: No longer pursuing Westgate Hotel as a proposed Chartist citizenship centre

Question  Representation Texts

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: Candidate Site has been withdrawn

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Proposed Chartist Citizenship Centre

Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: Westgate Hotel, Commercial Street

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Representation Text: ST 311882

Question: 2.4 Site Area

Representation Text: 1/4 acre approx.

Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

Representation Text: No interest has been shown by any other party in this therefore Accent Newport Trust does not intend to pursue this proposal.

Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

Council Response: Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. Details may require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

Council Response: Conservation Area

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

Council Response: Heritage walks contribute to the physical activity agenda which is at the forefront of WAG policy.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development for sites 155.C2 and 155.C3. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage
Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

For sites 1631.C1, 1631.C2, 1631.C3, 1631.C4, 1631.C5 and 1631.C6 it is unlikely that we will have any objections to their inclusion within the development plan.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

---

**Summary:** No longer pursuing Westgate Hotel as a proposed Chartist citizenship centre.

**Summary:** No longer wishes to pursue use of derelict buildings at junction of School Lane / Stow Hill for proposed refuge/sanctuary for young homeless and refuge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: No longer wishes to pursue use of derelict buildings at junction of School Lane / Stow Hill for proposed refuge/sanctuary for young homeless and refugee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: Overall Council Response**

Candidate Site has been withdrawn.

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

Representation Text: Proposed Refuge/Sanctuary for young Homeless & Refugees

**Question: 2.2 Location**

Representation Text: Derelict Buildings at junction of School Lane / Stow Hill.

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

Representation Text: ST 311880

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

Representation Text: 1/4 acre approx

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

Representation Text: Derelict

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text: No interest has been shown by any other party in this therefore Accent Newport Trust does not intend to pursue this proposal.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Council Response: Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. Details may require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

Council Response: Conservation Area

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

Council Response: Heritage walks contribute to the physical activity agenda which is at the forefront of WAG policy.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments
Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development for sites 155.C2 and 155.C3. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

For sites 1631.C1, 1631.C2, 1631.C3, 1631.C4, 1631.C5 and 1631.C6 it is unlikely that we will have any objections to their inclusion within the development plan.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements beign undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning deparment via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prioir to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C5</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Develop an annual series of events around the theme of The Chartists to be known as the Chartist Festival.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site: 10/ City Centre-Chartist**

**Question:** Overall Council Response  
**Council Response:** Candidate Site proposal is not a land use planning matter

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**  
**Representation Text:** Proposed 2 week annual Chartist Festival, Newport City Centre.

**Question: 2.2 Location**  
**Representation Text:** Newport City Centre - various venues - indoor and outdoor

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**  
**Representation Text:** See above

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**  
**Representation Text:** Various sites in Newport City Centre e.g. Newport Centre, Riverfront Theatre, Newport Museum, Westgate Square, John Frost Square, Clifton Park.

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**  
**Representation Text:** Develop an annual series of events around the theme of The Chartists to be known as the Chartist Festival.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**  
**Representation Text:** Stow Hill Ward is recognised as a deprived area and has been awarded Communities First status.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**  
**Council Response:** Conservation Area

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**  
**Representation Text:** Provision to be made for use of grey water systems.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**  
**Representation Text:** Newport Castle within 500m. The project will signpost other archaeological and heritage sites, encouraging tourist footfall.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
Summary: Develop an annual series of events around the theme of The Chartists to be known as the Chartist Festival.

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
   Representation Text: Stow Hill is a Conservation Area.
   Council Response: Some internal accessibility issues exist.

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
   Council Response: Heritage walks contribute to the physical activity agenda which is at the forefront of WAG policy.

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
   Council Response: No objection

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
   Council Response: No objection

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
   Council Response: No objection

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
   Council Response: No objection

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
   Council Response: No objection

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
   Council Response: No objection

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
   Representation Text: Welsh Water Comments
   Council Response: Sewerage

   From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development for sites 155.C2 and 155.C3. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

   Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.
For sites 1631.C1, 1631.C2, 1631.C3, 1631.C4, 1631.C5 and 1631.C6 it is unlikely that we will have any objections to their inclusion within the development plan.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 8** Other Information?

- Develop an annual Chartist Festival at the end of October/beginning of November developing and interpreting the heritage theme of Chartism. Building on the planned events in 2009 at Newport Centre, Newport Museum, Stow Hill and St. Mary's Institute, the Festival could be slowly expanded to market and brand the City of Newport in a new and positive way.

Possible Chartist Festival activities/events:
- Music performances
- Poetry events
- Street theatre
- Theatre productions
- Special museum exhibitions
- Youth conference and other events
- Public speaking competition for schools
- Exhibitions about citizenship
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Develop an annual series of events around the theme of The Chartists to be known as the Chartist Festival.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Exhibitions about green issues
- Chartist Conference
- Chartist literature promotions
- Chartist shop displays
- Chartist Food menus
- Exhibitions relating to Housing
- Exhibitions relating to Allotments.

All the above are directly related to Chartism and offer plenty of scope to develop these themes in various places in the city centre, both in buildings and in open spaces, during a Chartist Festival which will encourage tourist footfall and contribute to economic growth.

Question: 9 Map Included?
Representation Text: No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C6</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Public art to be installed in Westgate Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: 71/ Westgate Square

Question: Overall Council Response
Council Response: Candidate Site proposal is an existing use of the land

Question: 2.1 Site Name
Representation Text: Proposed enhanced interpretation / illumination of Chartist sculpture.

Question: 2.2 Location
Representation Text: Westgate Square, Chartist Sculpture

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
Representation Text: ST 311 882
Council Response: 331055 188125

Question: 2.4 Site Area
Council Response: 0.02Ha
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C6</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Public art to be installed in Westgate Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.5** **Brief Description**


**Question: 2.6** **Current Use**

Representation Text: Public art.

**Question: 2.7** **Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text: Public art.

**Question: 3.1** **Brownfield?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 3.10** **Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11** **Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.12** **Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Council Response: Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. Details may require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13** **Trees and Hedgerows?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Conservation Area

**Question: 3.15** **Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.16** **Archaeology?**

Representation Text: Yes. Newport Castle within 500m.

Council Response: Site is within a Conservation Area and Archaeologically Sensitive Area

**Question: 3.2** **Greenfield?**

Representation Text: No.
### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Poly</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C6</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public art to be installed in Westgate Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.7 SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** No.

#### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Stow Hill Conservation Area

**Council Response:** Site is within a Conservation Area.

#### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** No objection

#### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Council Response:** Heritage walks contribute to the physical activity agenda which is at the forefront of WAG policy.

#### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Council Response:** No objection

#### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Council Response:** No objection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631.C6</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public art to be installed in Westgate Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Council Response:** No objection

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Council Response:** No objection

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Council Response:**

### Question: 5.1 Schools?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. St Woolos Primary, St Mary's Primary, Maindee Primary

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. This has been discussed in the Stow Hill Communities First Partnership Board meeting. Wider consultation is now necessary.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

- **Welsh Water Comments**

Sewerage

> From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development for sites 155.C2 and 155.C3. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

For sites 1631.C1, 1631.C2, 1631.C3, 1631.C4, 1631.C5 and 1631.C6 it is unlikely that we will have any objections to their inclusion within the development plan.
Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.
## Public art to be installed in Westgate Square

**Summary:** Public art to be installed in Westgate Square. An interest in St Mary's Institute nearby.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question: 8 Other Information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>The bronze group of Christ sculptures in Westgate Square stand in a very prominent city centre site, but the statues themselves are understated and perhaps misunderstood. Few of the many thousands of people who pass by this site know the significance or the names of the figures, let alone what the whole sculpture represents. Tourists remain baffled. Careful and sympathetic interpretation of the figures, explaining in easy to understand language the reason for having the sculptures at that site would enhance the sense of heritage of Westgate Square, add to the visitor experience, and raise the profile of the city. Appropriate illumination of the sculptures at night would further increase their appreciation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question: 9 Map Included?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633.C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 112/ South of GreenStreet Farm, South Row, Redwick

**Question:** Representation Texts

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

Within SSSI, close to SPA, RAMSAR; Gwent Levels (Redwick/Magor/Undy: Redwick/Magwyr/Gwendy character area “Irregular field pattern of small fields (includes some regular areas), drainage features (reens, surface drainage) include major medieval reens, seawall includes relict sea wall (SAM)”: development unlikely to have direct effect in itself but any potential cumulative effects to be mitigated through LDP policies.
- Flood Zone C1: mitigation should be included where possible. Bungalow style dwelling may not be appropriate as ground floor sleeping accommodation increases the risk from flooding.
- The design of any development must take into account the environmental and historical designations of the site, ensuring no negative effects occur.
- The sewerage infrastructure of the site should ensure that the potential for pollution to water resources is minimised.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

The proposal is to continue to use the land for agricultural grazing.

The site is located in the open countryside outside of the settlement boundary of Redwick. It is also located in an area of high landscape value on the caldicot levels.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land South of Greenstreet Farm

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** South Row, Redwick, Newport.

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 4184 4284

**Council Response:** 341784 184372
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1633.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
- **Representation Text:** 0.67ha
- **Council Response:** 0.78 hectares

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- **Representation Text:** Two sides bordered with hedges, some old trees on North Aspect.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text:** Agricultural (Horse Grazing)

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text:** Agricultural/ grazing of horses

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Area within proposed SLA 5 Caldicot Level. Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** SSSI

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1633.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** The site is greenfield

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** Not sure (website not available)

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

- **Representation Text:** No. Drainage ditch between road and land.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

- **Council Response:** SSSI Caldicot Levels

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**
  - Listed building n/a
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park n/a
  - conservation area n/a
  - Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:**
  - yes
  - yes visibility splay of 2.4x 215 metres due and appear achievable

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
### Heritage walks contribute to the physical activity agenda which is at the forefront of WAG policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Bus Route?</td>
<td>adjacent site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Bus Frequency?</td>
<td>1-2 hour freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Railway Station?</td>
<td>Newport station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Convenience Shop?</td>
<td>Magor square 4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Walking and Cycling?</td>
<td>Site bounds a cycle way to the south on site provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Public Rights of Way?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Schools?</td>
<td>Village Hall, Church and public house in Redwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Community Engagement?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?</td>
<td>Welsh Water Comments Sewerage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelwork’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Council Response: Divorced from settlement boundary
### Summary
Extend Development Boundary to include land at South of GreenStreet Farm, South Row, Redwick.

### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
**Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
**Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
**Representation Text:** Yes. Right of way Re access to my land.

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?
**Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?
**Representation Text:** Yes. Extend the NUDP to include this land.

**Council Response:** allocated as undeveloped coastal zone and Countryside within the UDP

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Relevant Planning History on adjoining sites:

98/0740 CHANGE OF USE TO PET CREMATORIUM GREENSTREET FARM GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 9 Map Included?
**Representation Text:** Yes.
1654.1654.C1
03/06/2009
P
P
W
M
Summary: Candidate Site for Airport

Site: 2/ Airpot

Question: Representation Texts

Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response: It is recommended that this site is not carried forward as significant negative effects are predicted against the following social and environmental designations and features:
- SAC;
- Flood Risk;
- SSSI;
- SINC;
- SPA;
- RAMSAR;
- Public Rights of Way (x10);
- TPOs (x2);
- Loss of ecological connectivity;
- Greenfield land;
- Agricultural Land;
- Landscape value and visual intrusion;
- Air quality;
- Noise pollution;
- Lack of existing infrastructure;
- Water quality and integrity of Severn Estuary;
- Archaeological Sensitive Area (part of site);
- Gwent Levels Historic Landscape; and
- Tourism potential.

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: The Council does not have jurisdiction to approve major airport development, nor is sufficient information provided to enable the relevant authority to do so. Therefore no allocation is made.

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Airport

Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: Adjoining Bishton

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Representation Text: 339017 188114
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Site Area</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>1090 ha (Stage 1, 600ha, Stage 2, 490ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Brief Description</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Airport with runways in estuary and landside facilities surrounding Bishton, north of steelworks and railway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Current Use</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Airport / rail terminal and supporting development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Brownfield?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Agricultural Land?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>Yes. Classification not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>The development is to be in a parkland setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/06/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Small area front the railway.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area including infrastructure in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** Part of the site is proposed to be developed within the Severn Estuary, the majority of the site is within zone C1 flood risk

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. A small area of SSSI.
- **Council Response:** The site runs through the Gwent Levels SSSI, part of the site is within the Severn Estuary SPA, SAC, RAMSAR site. SINCs Parmt Yr Eos Wood, Ridings Wood, Wilcrick Fort West and Draig-y-perthi field south

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** There are species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

16/02/2012
### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. M4, M48 and mainline railway.
- **Council Response:** Yes will require across from steelworks road - possible dwelling
  TA required

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** They already exist.
- **Council Response:** Heritage walks contribute to the physical activity agenda which is at the forefront of WAG policy.

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** It is to be on site.

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
- **Representation Text:** Not known.
- **Council Response:** New bus service required

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
- **Representation Text:**
- **Council Response:**

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Representation Text:** Newport 3 miles.
- **Council Response:** Newport station possible rail link required

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** Retail is included in the development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.6 Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</strong></td>
<td>The development, when complete will create upwards of 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.7 Walking and Cycling?</strong></td>
<td>Cycle tracks and footpaths form part of the concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not applicable for use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.8 Public Rights of Way?</strong></td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROW 388/12 Restricted Byway 388/2 404/1 388/1 385/1 392/2 392/1 392/15 392/15A 392/26 on the Levels, and loads more inland, north of the steelworks &amp; south of the M4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.9 Open Space?</strong></td>
<td>Adjoining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1 Schools?</strong></td>
<td>Newport is the nearest. A site for a school is incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2 Community Engagement?</strong></td>
<td>Negotiations are in progress with the Assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3 Community Aspirations?</strong></td>
<td>See documents already submitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Latest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1654.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/06/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Airport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:** Reservoir on site. Site to be self-supporting in power, water, waste. All other utilities available.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No. See documents already submitted.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** No. A new infrastructure is to be created.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated within the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions are included within any planning consents.

**Water Supply**

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelworks’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

**Sewerage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from...
Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
Representation Text: The concept is for a new community based on the defence of a new international airport.

Council Response: The site is outside the settlement boundary

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
Representation Text: The development will encourage other development.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
Representation Text: No. The site is for an international class airport and is to be safeguarded under the Planning Act 2008. [Note from NCC: No formal submission has been made under the Planning Act as at 12 June 2009.]

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
Representation Text: Not known.

Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1654.C1</td>
<td>03/06/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
Yes. 1 to 3 years subject to planning approval.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** Part of the site lies within the Severn Estuary. The rest of the site covers a variety of allocations including Countryside, Green Wedge, waste disposal site, white land (Existing industrial), in the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** Not known.
- **Council Response:**
  - ERECTION OF 2NO. DETACHED DWELLINGS
    05/1465 13/04/2006 Refused
  - DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
    98/0701 21/04/1999Refused
  - RENEWAL OF O/L PLANNING PERMISSION 1/17010 DEVELOPMENT OF LAND BY THE ERECTION OF A MOTORWAY SERVICE STATION MOTEL AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES
    91/0893 01/05/1992 Refused
  - DEVELOPMENT OF THEME PARK & LEISURE COMPLEX INC. COVERED THEMED AREA FESTIVAL VILLAGE HOTELS HOLIDAY VILLAGE CONFERENCE FACILITIES FILM STUDIOS NEW AND IMPROVED ACCESS (INC. TUNNELS UNDER THE M4) AND CAR PARKING, ADMINISTRATIVE AND STAFF ACCOMMODATION AND LANDSCAPING
    98/1150 23/12/1999 Refused
  - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
    99/0187 05/05/1999 Refused
  - SPORTS FISHING COMPLEX CLUB HOUSE AND 48 LODGES WITH A 16 ACRE LAKE
    90/0054 09/03/1990 Refused
  - DEVELOPMENT OF 500 DWELLINGS SHOPPING CENTRE RESTAURANT PUB PRIMARY SCHOOL HEALTH CENTRE COMMUNITY HALL & WORKSHOPS LANDSCAPING TOGETHER WITH A LINK ROAD BETWEEN RINGLAND WAY AND UNDERWOOD (OUTLINE)
    90/1340 19/12/1991 Refused
  - WORKS TO PROVIDE SUPPLEMENTARY WATER SUPPLY TO WETLANDS RESERVE: AMENDMENT TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SCHEME
    99/0777 18/08/1999 Granted with conditions
  - FORMATION OF TWO FISHING LAKES WITH CAR PARKING PERMIT OFFICE & TOILET FACILITIES ACCESS VIA GOLDCLIFF ROAD
    92/0164 11/12/1992 Refused
  - CHANGE OF USE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS TO WETLAND RESERVE WITH ANCILLARY STORAGE OF MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT
    96/0046 07/07/1997 Allowed at Appeal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1654.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/06/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Airport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPORTS FISHING COMPLEX CLUB HOUSE AND 20 LODGES WITH A 4.75 ACRE LAKE AND 14 ACRES FOR NATURE RESERVE - REVISED APPLICATION FOLLOWING REFUSAL OF 90/0054/F
90/0744 07/09/1990 Refused

IMPROVEMENT OF 1300 METRES OF SEA DEFENCES
95/0211 02/06/1995 Granted with Conditions

90/1273 – Type B1 Business Park development - Refused

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
Representation Text: Not known.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
Representation Text: Not known.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
Representation Text: See previous submission.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
Representation Text: Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1664.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed business park on land to south of Celtic Way and South Lake Drive, Coedkernew, West Newport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: SA Recommendation**

It is recommended that only the previously developed sites are considered for development. Development in the ASA should be avoided where possible.

Public open space should be provided as part of development, especially where development includes residential provision or employment.

It should be ensured that there will be no net increase in surface water runoff as a result of development to reduce the increased risk of flooding through the development of the greenfield site, especially where this may include sensitive uses such as residential accommodation.

It should be ensured that the mix of uses provided on site cover the full range of community services and facilities required within walking distance including those in Table 3.4.

**Council Response:**

The candidate site forms part of Employment Allocation Policy EM1(i), which is considered to be of key importance to Newport and the region. The extent of the allocation has been determined by the proposed Duffryn Link Road, which will form a physical boundary to the allocation. Proposals would need to demonstrate that the national economic benefits of the proposal outweigh the environmental impacts. Conservation and enhancement of the SSSI features will need to be central to the consideration of any strategic proposals for the area.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

The candidate site forms part of Employment Allocation Policy EM1(i), which is considered to be of key importance to Newport and the region. The extent of the allocation has been determined by the proposed Duffryn Link Road, which will form a physical boundary to the allocation. Proposals would need to demonstrate that the national economic benefits of the proposal outweigh the environmental impacts. Conservation and enhancement of the SSSI features will need to be central to the consideration of any strategic proposals for the area.

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

Representation Text: Newport West

**Question: 2.2 Location**

Representation Text: Land to south of Celtic Way and South Lake Drive, Coedkernew, West Newport.

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

Council Response: 328501 184095

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

Representation Text: 12 ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

Representation Text: The site is a large level site which has been subject to extensive ground works and partially developed with roads and hard standings in association with the construction of the former LG factory.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

Representation Text: Vacant, previously developed land associated with former LG Factory.

Council Response: Currently allocated in the UDP under Policy ED1 (i) as Employment Land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Date Lodgd</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1664.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

**Representation Text:** A sustainable Business Park for up to 50,000 sq m of B1 office floor space, along with associated support services and uses, car parking, landscaping and public open space, for Government Office relocations.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site has been extensively re-graded, levelled and subject to tipping/filling in association with the former LG factory construction process. The site contains hard standings and roads.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site is within the existing urban area of Newport adjoined to the north by the former LG factory. Development of the site would be seen within this context. From adjoining areas to the south the development would provide a high quality and improved built form to this area which would be enhanced further by the integrated landscaping within the proposals.

**Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Sparse hedgerow cover.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The proposals will incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage System which could include new ponds, swales, rhynes/ditches and/or other measures. These features would be integrated into the overall development. These along with the site’s landscaping would enhance the ecological and landscape value/potential of the site.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The proposals will incorporate areas of landscaping and structural landscaping which will connect into the surrounding network.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area.
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1664.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed business park on land to south of Celtic Way and Sout lake Drive, Coedkernew, West Newport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fairly Significant Restraint.** Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. The site is at slight risk of contamination from the previous general construction works associated with the LG site. However these are not likely to be significant issues and can be readily addressed and resolved through a site investigation and preparation of an appropriate remediation strategy.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

*Representation Text:* No. The site is located outside the defined areas of flood risk within TAN 15.

**Council Response:** Part C1 flood risk area

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

*Representation Text:* No. The site is not adjacent to any defined watercourses. There are however rhynes located to the south of the site within the Gwent Levels SSSI. Accordingly any development and as required for LG and Quinn Radiators would ensure that any surface water run off and its associated quality was appropriately attenuated and controlled to prevent adverse effects on the rhyme system.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

*Representation Text:* No. The site is readily developable.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

*Representation Text:* No. The site itself is not subject to any enviromental designations. However land to the south is within the Gwent Levels SSSI. No development is proposed in this area. Recognising the proximity of the site to the SSSI, the development would utilise appropriate design and construction solutions to prevent any adverse effect on the recognised features of importance within the SSSI.

**Council Response:** Adjoins a SSSI to the south of the site

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

*Representation Text:* A detailed ecological study has been undertaken in 2008. This has shown the presence of reptiles and bats within the site. However with appropriate mitigation these species would not prevent the development of the site.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
**Proposed business park on land to south of Celtic Way and South Lake Drive, Coedkernew, West Newport**

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. The site has a good accessibility to the local and national highway network with access via Celtic Way and ?? to the A48 and further afield. This network and with potential improvements including the M4 bypass is capable of supporting the proposed development alongside other measures to encourage the use of public transport, walking and cycling (such as a Green Travel Plan).

**Council Response:**

- **Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
  - The site would reuse a derelict and unused site within the existing urban area. It would provide new areas of landscaping including areas of open space.
  - **Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

- **Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
  - The site would provide new customers to reinforce the existing bus services along the A48 and in the immediate area. There is also potential for services to route through the site via South Lake Drive and Celtic Way onto the A48.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

- **Representation Text:** 400m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

- **Representation Text:** 10 per hour to Newport City Centre from the A48.

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

- **Representation Text:** Newport City Centre

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

- **Representation Text:** The proposed development will include all necessary services as facilities for a high-quality office park including a local convenience shop. Additionally ASDA is located less than 800m to the south east of the site.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- **Representation Text:** The site is highly accessible to potential employees being within the existing urban area of Newport, well served by public transport, walking, cycling and pedestrian routes. It is also highly accessible by private car.
Summary: Proposed business park on land to south of Celtic Way and Sout lake Drive, Coedkernew, West Newport

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
Representation Text: The site is located within 400m of the National Sustrans Route 4 on the A48. New connections would be provided to this from the site along with pedestrian pavements to the A48. Additionally the development would include a Green Travel Plan to encourage and facilitate use of non-car modes of transport.

Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 4.9 Open Space?
Representation Text: Tredegar Park, 400m to the east of the site. The development would also include areas of open space for recreation and relaxation.

Question: 5.1 Schools?
Representation Text: Nor applicable as the proposals are for employment use and do not include a residential element.

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
Representation Text: Yes. The site is presently allocated for general employment use within the Newport UDP.

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
Representation Text: The proposed development would provide major employment opportunities for potentially up to 2,500 direct jobs with further spin off employment opportunities to the wider economy.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
Representation Text: The site has ready access to all necessary services and facilities to deliver the development.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
Representation Text: No. The proposed development for B1 office uses is entirely appropriate in relation to the site’s surroundings and adjoining uses.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
Representation Text: Yes. The site forms part of the area previously proposed for further expansion of the LG factory. The site therefore benefits from appropriate services and these could be readily improved if required in order to support the proposed development.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments
Sewerage
From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1664.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Proposed business park on land to south of Celtic Way and Sout lake Drive, Coedkernew, West Newport

Considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. The B1 office proposals will include employment uses. These uses are entirely compatible with the surrounding land uses. Residential properties are located approximately 100m to the south of east of the site. The development will be designed and will include appropriate measures to prevent any adverse effect on the amenity of these properties.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

*Representation Text:* The site is already within the existing urban area and is previously developed land. The proposed development would provide a high quality built form to this area and will include appropriate landscaping.

*Council Response:* Within Newport Urban Area

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

*Representation Text:* The site is within the existing urban area, is previously developed land and is sustainably located. The development for the proposed purpose would reduce the pressure for development upon potentially Greenfield sites at less sustainable locations. The proposals will therefore reduce the pressure to develop on other less sustainable sites.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

*Representation Text:* No. Helical Governetz is a prospective purchaser of the site.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

*Representation Text:* No. As above.
### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
**Representation Text:** No. We are not aware of any restrictive covenants.

### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?
**Representation Text:** Yes. The first phase of development could be delivered immediately and thus subject to planning permission etc, development could commence within 3 years from 2009.

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
**Representation Text:** No. Not that we are aware of.

### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
**Representation Text:** No.

---

**PROPOSED RAW WATER PRE-TREATMENT PLANT AND EXTERNAL STORAGE TANKS**


GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

PROPOSED DIVERSION OF THE CILFYNYDD-MELKSHAM 400KV OVERHEAD LINE

GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

Relevant planning history on adjoining sites:
- 02/0615 ERECTION OF 37 DWELLINGS COMPRISING SEMI DETACHED AND TERRACED DWELLINGS AND 2NO. 3 STOREY APARTMENT BLOCKS LAND ADJOINING PENCARN AVENUE WITHDRAWN
- 99/0118 MIXED DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING OF TWO STOREY OFFICE BLOCK AND HOUSING PENCARN FARM (LAND ADJ)
- 03/0422 ERECTION OF 18NO. DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGING AND PARKING AND 2NO. 2 STOREY OFFICE BLOCKS FOR B1 USE LANDADJACENT PENCARN LANE
- 96/0895 CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT UNIT (5 585 SQM) AND PROVISION OF 150 CAR PARKING SPACES AND LANDSCAPING IMPERIAL COURTYARD (LAND ADJ) GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1664.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed business park on land to south of Celtic Way and Southlake Drive, Coedkernew, West Newport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

- **Question: 8 Other Information?**
  - Representation Text: Not that we are aware of.

- **Question: 9 Map Included?**
  - Representation Text: Yes.
Question: SA Recommendation

Development is large scale and thus is likely to have a large effect on the landscape quality of the area. Mitigation should be ensured through the masterplanning process as well as through design codes to minimise any negative effects. This could be done through the development of green infrastructure to provide ecological corridors as well as walking and cycling routes throughout the site and connecting the site to the wider area. This should incorporate any existing trees and hedgerows on the site. Lodge Wood SINC should be maintained and enhanced where possible-

Although the site is not within the flood plain, it should be ensured that there is no net increase in surface water runoff as a result of development, to reduce the increase in flood risk. Green infrastructure could incorporate SUDS to enable this. It should be ensured that the development does not negatively affect the SAM or its setting. The mix of uses could include uses that may encourage the development of tourism in the historic town of Caerleon, and capitalising on its assets, alongside the provision of facilities and services for local people.

Council Response:

Question: Overall Council Response

The site is a Greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Caerleon, designated as Green Wedge and Countryside. The land has also been identified as an area of predominantly high value in the LANDMAP assessment. The site has a Scheduled Ancient Monument within its boundary. There are a number of Tree Preservation Orders on the Site and a number of Public Rights of Way.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.

Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8

This site was also considered as part of the Unitary Development Plan inquiry. In considering whether the site should be included in the Unitary Development Plan and the allocation of Green Wedge removed, the Inspector recommended that the Green Wedge allocation was retained due to the fact that the exclusion of this prominent parcel of land from the proposed Green Wedge and it development in the manner proposed would make a significant contribution to the coalescence of Caerleon and Cwmbran (Ref para 1.259) and that the site would extend the built up area of Caerleon beyond the wooded ridgeline at Lodge Wood, an intrusion I do not consider to be justified by a need for additional housing. The northern part of the site would extend into the proposed Green Wedge (SP4 xii) between Caerleon and Cwmbran and its development would significantly erode the gap between those settlements. (Ref para 3.100 of the Inspectors Report)

It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated as Green Wedge and Countryside that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a mixed use allocation.
Sitename: Park Farm, Caerleon

Location: Land between the A4042 and the B4236 Ponthir Road, Caerleon.

Grid Reference: 318 917

Site Area: Approximately 201 hectares

Brief Description: The site comprises individual fields divided by existing hedgerows. The site is characterised by gently sloping areas to the east and the remainder generally slopes east to west towards the A4042.

Current Use: Agricultural land.

Proposed Use(s): Creation of a link road. Mixed use allocation, potentially including residential, employment, community uses, open space, education facilities, governmental uses and healthcare uses.

Brownfield?: No.

Minerals Safeguarding Area?: No.

Agricultural Land?: Yes. Grade 4.

Welsh Government comment: Low probability of BMV. SE Edge limited to grade 4 on slope. Rest of site likely to be a mix of 3b and 4. This is supported by a pre-revision survey (002/1978) that found the area to be a mix of 3b and 4.

Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.
Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:**
To the south and west of the site, the landscape is urban in character, with open areas of countryside to the north. The proposed development would therefore form an extension to the existing urban area.

**Conclusions from the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment undertaken indicate the the site can be developed in such a way as to avoid coalescence between Malpas and Caerleon through masterplanning. 'Green Space' retained in strategic locations would retain the visual separation between settlements and integrate the development into the landscape.**

**Council Response:**
Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of mostly High value in LANDMAP Area. Ecological, PROW issues.

Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. There are a number of mature trees and hedgerows currently on the site. These are not protected.

**Council Response:**
Protected trees 78/Mon 9asl 10ak Entire Wood protected by TPOs 78 Mon and 2 of 1994, also 50% of the woodland is ancient woodland as denoted by the Forestry Commission.

Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**
The proposed development will aim to protect or enhance any biodiversity or landscape features within the site, through sensitive masterplanning.

Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Green spaces and corridors can be retained in strategic locations through appropriate masterplanning.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. The site includes the northern outer ramparts of an Iron Age Hillfort (Lodge Hill Camp) which is a scheduled as an ancient monument.

**Council Response:**
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Lodge Hill is an Iron Age Hillfort and a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Area is crossed by Roman road. Major Restraint. Direct impact on scheduled ancient monument and on its setting. The area should not be allocated in LDP.

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:**
No.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1665.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Mixed use allocation on land at Park Farm, Caerleon including residential, employment, community uses, open space, education and govt and healthcare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
*Representation Text:*
Yes. The Usk river is not within the site, but is located to the south of its boundary.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
*Representation Text:*
No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
*Representation Text:*
No. The SSSI related to the Usk river, is not within the site but does lie to the south, which will be protected through appropriate masterplanning.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
*Representation Text:*
Yes. Investigations have not yet been undertaken, however, they will be required given the large scale nature of the site. The scale of the site is such that appropriate mitigation measures can be incorporated into any development scheme.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
*Representation Text:*
No.
*Council Response:*
Scheduled Ancient Monument - Lodge Wood Camp
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments (within) historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
*Representation Text:*
Yes. The development proposed would enable, and be accessed by, a proposed new link road between the A4042 and the B4236 Ponthir Road, which would be capable of supporting the level of traffic generated by the site, as well as creating a positive impact on the historic town of Caerleon by providing a bypass.
*Council Response:*
yes however, local highway networks not capable of accommodation development access to A4042 trunk road- wag transport assessment required.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
*Representation Text:*
No. The proposed development will provide for open space, as an integral element of the scheme.
*Council Response:*
The proposed development falls within the Caerleon Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 3.64Ha. If this site was developed for residential purposes, on-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population. The master plan would need to meets the requirements of TAN16 for the provision of Sport,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The site will provide for a new link road, which will allow for the potential of new or amended bus routes to run through the site, which will improve public transport connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Bus Route?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Bus routes are available approximately 100 metres from the eastern boundary of the site. Additionally, bus routes are available approximately 400 metres from the western boundary of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Council Response: | south bound 250 m  
north bound 200m |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Bus Frequency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The frequency of buses along the route closest to the eastern boundary of the site is approximately 1 per hour, with more frequent services during peak morning and evening times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>20-30 min frequency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Railway Station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Newport Railway Station is approximately 2 miles from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>newport station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Convenience Shop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Caerleon High School is approximately 1 mile to the south of the site, which offers a range of shops and services. A missed use scheme has the potential to provide new local facilities within the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Council Response: | 250 metres to edge of site Punthir Road Spar  
1.2km to caerleon centre. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The site is in close proximity to the town of Caerleon, as well as Newport City Centre, which has access to a wide range of jobs and community services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Walking and Cycling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The proposed development will facilitate and make provision for cyclists and pedestrians. Potential exists to improve links to Newport City Centre and Caerleon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Council Response: | ROW - 389/1  
on site provision & infrastructure. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Public Rights of Way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1665.C1</td>
<td>389/8</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed use allocation on land at Park Farm, Caerleon including residential, employment, community uses, open space, education and govt and healthcare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Response: 389/8 9 11 12 14 17

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:**

A comprehensive masterplan will provide for appropriate areas of useable open space within the proposed development.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Local schools include Caerleon Comprehensive School which is located approximately 1 mile to the south of the site. Additionally, Caerleon Endowed Infants & Juniors and Caerleon Lodge Hill Infants and Juniors are all approximately 1 mile from the site.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**

The development will provide for a link road between the A4042 and the B4236 Ponthir Road. The link would not only bring about improvements to the highways network and alleviate congestion within Caerleon, but would also serve to bring about a strategic opportunity to meet the future needs for development land for the City.

The site is capable of accommodating a strategic, mixed use allocation to include residential, employment and leisure uses. It is also considered capable of accommodating other strategic development requirements for the City, such as education, governmental and healthcare uses. As such, the development of this site could be capable of meeting a variety of community aspirations.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:**

To be confirmed.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Council Response: Welsh Water Comments**

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the
Summary: Mixed use allocation on land at Park Farm, Caerleon including residential, employment, community uses, open space, education and government and healthcare environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: Yes. Employment uses are proposed on the site and appropriate masterplanning will ensure that the distances between them and residential uses are suitable.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: The site is located on the northern edge of Caerleon and on the edge of the Newport urban area. As such, the development would form a logical and defensible extension to the existing urban area.

Council Response: The site is in part directly adjacent to the settlement boundary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.6</th>
<th>Precedent Setting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The proposed development will provide for a link road, and as such, the link may facilitate the development of adjoining areas, which would have improved transport connections. The proposed link road will relieve the traffic and congestion which currently runs through Caerleon. As such, this will have a positive impact on the town and the development potential of a number of sites within it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.1</th>
<th>Site Owned by Proposer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.2</th>
<th>Site Owner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.3</th>
<th>Interest in Adjoining Land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.4</th>
<th>Restrictive Covenants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.5</th>
<th>Realistic Timescale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. It is expected that work would start on the site within either the 1-3 year of the 4-6 year periods of the start of the LDP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.6</th>
<th>Development Boundary Change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. The site is currently within an area designated as Countryside and Green Wedge within the adopted UDP. This would need removing and a designation for a mixed use development on the site added.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.7</th>
<th>Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92/1032 ERECTION OF NEW DWELLING (AMENDMENT TO PREVIOUS APPROVAL) GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS 11-Dec-1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95/1055 ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING REFUSED 23-Feb-1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES WITH PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND AMENITIES PROVISION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1665.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Mixed use allocation on land at Park Farm, Caerleon including residential, employment, community uses, open space, education and govt and healthcare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
**Representation Text:** Please see accompanying covering letter and Statement for further information on the proposals.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
**Representation Text:** Yes.
### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
- May affect a SINC designated site: potential effects should be investigated and mitigated prior to development on site.
- Public rights of way as well as additional walking and cycling routes (including safe routes to school) should be developed through the design process.
- Development should be located away from the watercourse as part of the river walkway scheme to reduce potential pollution to water resources.
- It is recommended that local convenience stores are provided as part of the mix of uses to reduce the need to travel.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
- This site is put forward in conjunction with the land immediately to the north, to form a larger allocation option (see also 1666.C2). The site was considered at the Unitary Development Plan Inquiry for inclusion in the plan as a residential allocation. In relation to the northern part of the land (1666.C2) the Inspector commented "the site is clearly part of the countryside on the outskirts of Pentrepoeth and for it to be developed as proposed it would be necessary to demonstrate a need for housing that outweighed the broad thrust of policies seeking to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the countryside" (para 3.80). With specific reference to this candidate site (ref 1666.C1 LDP) the Inspector notes that it is "predominantly open fields on the edge of the settlement and other than referring to a possible Bassaleg by pass – a scheme to which, in the absence of any assessment of need or feasibility, I attach little weight" (para 3.84).

- The forecast housing need for the Local Development Plan has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in the countryside cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

- The site is also identified as an area of high value in the LANDMAP assessment that formed the basis of the designated Special Landscape Areas – West of Rhiwderin, which the candidate site forms part of.

- It is therefore recommended that the candidate site is not allocated for housing in the Local Development Plan.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:**
- Land at the Griffin (1)

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:**
- Land at the Griffin, Bassaleg
**Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td>W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Education/Leisure use at Land at the Griffin (2), Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

- **Representation Text:** ST 271865
- **Council Response:** 327231 186559

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

- **Representation Text:** 2.74HA
- **Council Response:** 10.27

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

- **Representation Text:** Vacant site abutting built up area rising gently towards woodland belt.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

- **Representation Text:** Vacant Land

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

- **Representation Text:** Residential & Education/Leisure use

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representation Text:** No. Currently part vacant, part used for temporary grazing

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representation Text:** Well contained by natural wood boundary immediately adjacent to settlement boundary. Sensitive development of the site would not be intrusive.
- **Council Response:** Countryside comments:
  - Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Area within proposed SLA 7 Tredegar Park. Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Court wood on the eastern boundary & field boundaries. No TPO's
- **Council Response:** TPO woodland 11/87
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Education/Leisure use at Land at the Griffin (2), Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- **Representation Text:** Retention of court wood on the eastern boundary
- **Council Response:** SinC - Court Wood

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Not on the site. Scheduled ancient monument (Hill Fort) at Coed Y Defaid 500m beyond south of the site, visually seperated by woodland belt.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In essential setting of Tredegar Park (registered park). No known archaeological features. Restraint. The construction of residential dwellings in the area will compromise the essential setting of the registered historic park. However, area will be seen against the current background of the Bassaleg School and as a slight extension to it. The area could be allocated in LDP with proviso that the impact on the historic park could restrict development.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Small stream running through Bassaleg school and western section of site.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- **Representation Text:** No. not that we are aware of
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Residential and Education/Leisure use at Land at the Griffin (2), Bassaleg

---

**Council Response:** There is a species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

---

**Question: 3.9**  
**Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historic park n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation area n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Newport boundary

---

**Question: 4.1**  
**Access to Highway?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and cyclist improvements and traffic calming (Speed activated sign) can be provided to the Griffin. An improvement to the Griffin Junction with the A468 can be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered to be accessible for the public highway- the Griffin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Assessment to assess specific proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity at Griffin/Caerphilly Road Junction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road width 4.5-5m -substandard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footways - 60mph -30mph. The griffin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Question: 4.10**  
**Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing links between the site and open space are adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. It is likely that on-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Question: 4.11**  
**Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Question: 4.2**  
**Bus Route?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280m on the A468 Caerphilly Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly Road -350m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Question: 4.3**  
**Bus Frequency?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 buses per hour (Service number 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

- **Representation Text:** Rogerstone Station is circa 4.8km
  Newport Station is circa 5km

- **Council Response:** Newport

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

- **Representation Text:** 500m to a parade of shops located at Laurel Road. Four shops (Nisa local foodstore, Bassaleg Pharmacy, Fish bar and Hair Salon) as well as a post office at 400m on Caerphilly Road

- **Council Response:** Laurel Road shops -560m

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- **Representation Text:** Bassaleg Comprehensive School and Graig Community Hall are adjacent to the site. Tregwilym Industrial Estate is circa 2.7km from the site.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

- **Representation Text:** Pentrepoeth Primary School and Bassaleg Comprehensive School are within walking distance of the site

- **Council Response:** National cycle route on sites northern boundary
  The griffin
  No footways on Penylan Road

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Along northern boundary and through western section of the site.

- **Council Response:** PROW 393/11

  393/112

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- **Representation Text:** 150m to recreation and play area adjacent to Cowshed Lane

- **Council Response:** Site is surrounded by open countryside to the south
  There is equipped play space on land off Caerphilly Road/cowshed lane and informal open space on land off Caerphilly Road

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Bassaleg Comp- adjacent to site
  Pentrepoeth Primary School - 1 km

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- **Representation Text:** Improved Education/Leisure provision and mix and choice of housing

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- **Representation Text:** No. Development of site would create facilities

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- **Representation Text:** The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
  - **Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments
  - **Sewerage**
    - Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.
    - Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.
  - **Water supply**
    - It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.
    - **Sewerage treatment**
    - No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Education/Leisure use at Land at the Griffin (2), Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:** Logical extension to existing adjoining school and settlement

**Council Response:** The proposed site is directly adjacent to the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6** Precedent Setting?

**Representation Text:** Stand alone development

**Question: 7.1** Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Redrow/Pentrepoeth Landowners Group

**Question: 7.2** Site Owner?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Part owner

**Question: 7.3** Interest in Adjoining Land?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4** Restrictive Covenants?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5** Realistic Timescale?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Removal from Countryside and extension to settlement boundary

**Question: 7.6** Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Settlement boundary extension and removal from Countryside

**Question: 7.7** Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**

- DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING LOCAL CENTRE AND PRIMARY SCHOOL INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS
  93/0206 25-Feb-1994 REFUSED
- COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF 66 HECTARES (163 ACRES) OF LAND TO COMPRIS HOUSEUNG RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS (OUTLINE) - DUPLICATE APPLICATION
  90/0992 09-Nov-1990 REFUSED
- COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF 66 HECTARES (163 ACRES) OF LAND TO COMPRIS HOUSEUNG RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS (OUTLINE)
  90/0910 14-May-1992 REFUSED (DISMISSED AT APPEAL)
- DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING HOUSING AND RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Residential and Education/Leisure use at Land at the Griffin (2), Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DUPLICATE APPLICATION 90/0428 09-Nov-1990 REFUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING HOUSING AND RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS 90/0427 10-Dec-1990 WITHDRAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSING AND ASSOCIATED USES INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS 94/0521 06-Jan-1997 REFUSED (DISMISSED AT APPEAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (AFFECTING FOOTPATH NO.18) INCLUDING MEANS OF ACCESS TO SITE 98/0599 09-Oct-1998 WITHDRAWN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant Planning History on adjoining sites:
- 93/0207 CONSTRUCTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS LAND AT PENTRPOETH REFUSED
- 94/0522 PROPOSED BASSALEG BY-PASS LAND AT PENTRPOETH REFUSED (DISMISSED AT APPEAL)

**Question:** 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 8 Other Information?
- **Representation Text:**

**Question:** 9 Map Included?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Education/Leisure use on land at the Griffin (1) Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site: 63/ The Griffin (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issue:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Site Name</td>
<td>Land at the Griffin (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Location</td>
<td>Land at the Griffin, Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Grid Reference</td>
<td>ST 272865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Site Area</td>
<td>10.27HA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

This site is put forward in conjunction with the land immediately to the south, to allow for a choice of allocation size (see also 1666.C1). The site was considered at the Unitary Development Plan Inquiry for inclusion in the plan as a residential allocation. In relation to the northern part of the land (1666.C2) the Inspector commented "the site is clearly part of the countryside on the outskirts of Pentrepoeth and for it to be developed as proposed it would be necessary to demonstrate a need for housing that outweighed the broad thrust of policies seeking to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the countryside" (para 3.80).

The forecast housing need for the Local Development Plan has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in the countryside cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The site is also identified as an area of high value in the LANDMAP assessment that formed the basis of the designated Special Landscape Areas – West of Rhiwderin, which the candidate site forms part of.

It is therefore recommended that the candidate site is not allocated for housing in the Local Development Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Education/Leisure use on land at the Griffin (1) Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:** 23.61

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- Vacant site abutting built up area rising gently towards woodland belt.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- Vacant land

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- Education/Leisure use

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- No. Currently used for temporary grazing.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- Well contained by natural wood boundary immediately adjacent to settlement boundary. Development of education/leisure use would not be intrusive

**Council Response:**
- Countryside comments:
  - Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Area within proposed SLA 7 Tredegar Park. and SLA 2 West of Rhiwderin Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- Yes. Court Wood on the eastern boundary No TPO's

**Council Response:**
- TPO 11/87

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- Retention of Court Wood on the eastern boundary

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- Yes.
### Archaeology

**Representation Text:**

- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Crossed by line of Roman road. In essential setting of Tredegar Park (registered park). No known archaeological features.
- Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. The construction of residential dwellings in the area will compromise the essential setting of the registered historic park. However, area will be seen against the current background of settlement at Bassaleg and as an extension to it.
- The area could be allocated in LDP subject to results of archaeological evaluation and with proviso that the impact on the historic park could restrict development.

**Council Response:**

- There is a species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

### Greenfield

- **Yes.**

### Contaminated Land Risk

- **No.**

### Flood Risk

- **No.**

### Adjacent to Water Course

- **Yes.** Small stream running through Bassaleg School

### Topography / Stability Problems

- **No.**

### SSSI

- **No.**

### Protected Species

- **No.** Not that we are aware of

### Conservation Area or Listed Building

- **No.**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
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<th>DateLodgd</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Education/Leisure use on land at the Griffin (1) Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep’n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
<td>Late?</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status Modified</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
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<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for Education/Leisure use on land at the Griffin (1) Bassaleg conservation area n/a

**Within Newport boundary**

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Pedestrian and cyclist improvements and traffic calming (speed activated sign) can be provided to the Griffin. An improvement to the Griffin junction with the A468 can be considered.
- **Council Response:** Yes, The Griffin Penylan Road Pentrepoeth Road T.A required to assess specific proposals Pentrepoeth Road and Penylan Road are narrow, no footways. Lack of Capacity at Caerphilly road Junction and wider network i.e. forge loe roundabout.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
- **Representation Text:** The existing links between the site and open space are adequate
- **Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
- **Representation Text:** The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
- **Representation Text:** 280m on the A468 Caerphilly Road
- **Council Response:** A468 -Caerphilly Road.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
- **Representation Text:** 4 buses per hour (service number 50)
- **Council Response:** 30 min frequency

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
- **Representation Text:** Rogerstone station is circa 4.8km and Newport Station is circa 5km
- **Council Response:** Newport

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Education/Leisure use on land at the Griffin (1) Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
500m to a parade of shops located at Laurel Road. Four shops (Nisa local foodstore, Bassaleg Pharmacy, Fish Bar and Hair Salon) as well as a Post Office at 400m on Caerphilly Road.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
- Bassaleg Comprehensive School and Graig Community Hall are adjacent to the site. Tregwilym Industrial Estate is circa 2.7km from the site.

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- Pentrepoeth Primary School and Bassaleg Comprehensive School are within walking distance of the site.
- Lack of footways and on Pentrepoeth Road and Penylan Road. Unsuitable for encouraging multi-model Development.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- Yes. Along northern boundary.

**Representation Text:**
PROW 393/11, 393/113, 114 & 115

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- 150m to recreation and play area adjacent to Cowshed Lane.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- Yes. Bassaleg Comp - Adjacent to site
- Pentrepoeth Primary School - 1km

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- Improved education/leisure provision

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- No. Development of site would create facilities

**Question: 5.5 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Education/Leisure use on land at the Griffin (1) Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

- **Sewerage**
  
  Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

  Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

- **Water supply**
  
  It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site useage.

- **Sewerage treatment**
  
  No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** Logical extension to existing adjoining school

**Council Response:** Proposed site is directly adjacent to settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** Stand alone development

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for Education/Leisure use on land at the Griffin (1) Bassaleg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- Representation Text: Yes. Removal from countryside and extension to settlement boundary

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- Representation Text: Yes.
- Council Response: The site is currently outside of the settlement boundary and designated as countryside

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response:
  
  DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING LOCAL CENTRE AND PRIMARY SCHOOL INCLUDING EASTERN SECTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS
  
  93/0206 02-Mar-1994 REFUSED

  COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF 66 HECTARES (163 ACRES) OF LAND TO COMPRISE HOUSING RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS (OUTLINE) - DUPLICATE APPLICATION
  
  90/0992 09-Nov-1990 REFUSED

  COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF 66 HECTARES (163 ACRES) OF LAND TO COMPRISE HOUSING RELATED USES PUBLIC OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING BASSALEG BY-PASS AND RELATED HIGHWAY WORKS (OUTLINE)
  
  90/0910 14-May-1992 DISSMISSED AT APPEAL

  RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE)
  
  04/0397 01-Sep-2004 REFUSED

  HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: Awaiting response.

  WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION: Position of equipment

  GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: Potential for archaeological remains to be present, therefore recommend the submission of an archaeological field evaluation prior to the determination of the application, in compliance with the advice of Welsh Office Circular 60/96.

  EDUCATION-HEAD OF POLICY AND RESOURCES: Site falls within catchment of Pentrepoeth Primary and Bassaleg Secondary Schools. Both schools are over capacity and would be unable to accommodate the additional pupils this development would generate. A financial contribution would be required to fund these additional places.

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for Education/Leisure use on land at the Griffin (1) Bassaleg

GWENT POLICE: No objections, but would wish to comment on any detailed plan.

WELSH WATER: Request the imposition of conditions preventing the discharge of surface and land drainage run off to the public sewerage system and preventing the erection of any structure within an area 3m wide either side of the public sewer.

TRANSCO GAS: Position of equipment.

Relevant Planning History on adjoining sites:

90/1069 DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES (OUTLINE) REFUSED
93/0207 CONSTRUCTION OF BASSALEG BY-PASS LAND AT PENTRPOETH REFUSED
97/0103 ERECTION OF 11 NO. RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS BADGERS WOOD (LAND AT REAR) GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

Representation Text: 

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

Representation Text: Yes.
### Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response:

It is recommended that the site does not go forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:

- Flood Zone C1;
- May affect SPA; Ramsar;
- Part of site is within SSSI; adjacent to SINC;
- Likely to lead to significant increase in traffic dependent on volume of residential provision proposed- recommend development only be permitted if can be proven that public transport can be improved to increased frequency to centres of employment and the railway station;
- Within Archeologically Sensitive Area and Gwent Levels Historic Landscape Characterisation Area Trowbridge: Trowbridge: “a very remote area of landscape)- development likely to significantly affect the character of the area as would be a large increase in existing settlement size (especially cumulatively with Marshfield East allocation); and
- Increased pollution from traffic (air and noise).

### Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response:

This site is located north of the settlement of Marshfield. It is a greenfield site in the Green Belt.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Land off Marshfield Road, Marshfield, Wentlooge, Newport

### Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: Land off Marshfield Road, Marshfield, Wentlooge, Newport

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
Summary: Candidate Site for mixed use residential, community facilities and minor on land off Marshfield Road

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
Representation Text: Approx. 4.5 Hectares (10.5 Acres)
Council Response: 4.27

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
Representation Text: Generally open and level land currently used for agricultural purposes

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
Representation Text: Agricultural Land

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
Representation Text: Mixed use: residential, community facilities, minor retail

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
Representation Text: Yes. Land classification not known

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
Representation Text: Predominantly level landscape, site located adjoining existing residential development to the south therefore minimal isolated long-range views

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
Representation Text: Yes. Hedgerows on external field boundaries although can be retained within any development proposals.
Council Response: No TPOs on site
Hedgerow trees. TPO potential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1667.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- **Representation Text:** Provision of green corridors, accessible wildlife areas, green spaces and community recreation facilities

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Provide access to countryside area, walks and recreation facilities

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No. Outside flood zone
- **Council Response:** Part of site is within Zone C1

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Ditches and reens in locality of site

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- **Representation Text:** No. Agricultural land so unlikely

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
### Representation: 1667.C1

**Date Lodged:** 05/05/2009  
**Access No:**  
**Source:** P  
**Type:** P  
**Mode:** W  
**Status:** M  
**Status Modified:**  

**Summary:** Candidate Site for mixed use residential, community facilities and minor on land off Marshfield Road

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Immediately adjoining the main public highway
- Yes- Marshfield Road
- Visibility Splays - 2.4mx90m appear achievable at two locations.
- <100 Units will require a transport assessment.

**Council Response:**

- Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

  **Representation Text:** Provide pathways, links, open spaces, green corridors, accessible wildlife areas, green spaces and community recreation facilities

  **Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. The proposed development is approximately 1.2Km from the nearest play provision so a LEAP would be required on-site to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, with off-site contributions for formal play facilities locally.

- Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

  **Representation Text:** Provide direct footpath links to public transport routes

  **Council Response:**

- Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

  **Representation Text:** Less than 50 metres

  **Council Response:** Marshfield Road

- Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

  **Representation Text:** Approximately one per hour

  **Council Response:** 1-2 hour frequency

- Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

  **Representation Text:** Approximately 4 miles

  **Council Response:** Newport at 9.5km

- Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

  **Representation Text:** Less than 50 metres, one shop, however this proposal would allow the creation of additional local shopping facilities

  **Council Response:** Marshfield Road P.O and shop 500m

- Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

  **Representation Text:** Less than 0.25 miles from employment at St Mellons, less than 1 miles from A48 and access to Cardiff and Newport centres

- Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

  **Representation Text:**

  **Council Response:**

16/02/2012
### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Footways on Marshfield Road Development is provide internal infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROW 399/1 PROW FPs 399/12 &amp; 399/16</td>
<td>In village centre approx. 100 metres although provision can be made on site for enhanced open space provision Informal playspace at The Meadows, Marshfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 5.1 Schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Marshfield Primary School, 4 other primary schools within 4 miles. 5 Secondary schools within 3 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of enhanced community facilities and buildings, open areas and a range of residential and commercial opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Additional community facilities can be provided within the proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 50 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Welsh Water Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1667.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for mixed use residential, community facilities and minor on land off Marshfield Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Yes. Can be designed within the site. Small-scale employment/commercial/shopping facilities can be included as community scale facilities

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: Logical Extension?

Immediately adjoining existing pattern of development in village centre

Council Response: The site is adjacent to the village boundary of Marshfield

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text: Precedent Setting?

To be able to provide a comprehensive development masterplan for the whole site including mixed use, community facilities without pressure on existing facilities. Opportunity for investment in mixed use development.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

Representation Text: Site Owned by Proposer?

Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

Representation Text: Site Owner?

Yes.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1667.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for mixed use residential, community facilities and minor on land off Marshfield Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. See blue area

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Changes to position of existing development boundary
- **Council Response:** The site is located within the current Green Belt and Countryside designation of the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING FOOTPATH NO.27
  97/1253 06-Apr-1998 REFUSED
  Relevant Planning History on adjoining sites:
  93/0190 REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE FOR HOUSING ALLIED BREWERIES DEPOT GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS
  94/0291 DEVELOPMENT OF PHASE I OF THE SITE FOR THE ERECTION OF 63 NO. TWO STOREY DWELLINGS WITH ROAD LAYOUT AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE APROVED WITH CONDITIONS
  90/0198 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (5 DWELLINGS) REFUSED

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
- **Representation Text:** Opportunity to provide a mixed use site to enable a mix of residential types, low cost housing, community enhancement, minor retail outlets, through mixed use, mixed tenure and housing ownership options. Opportunity to provide housing association housing within a comprehensive development strategy in close proximity to existing employment centres and main public transport routes/arterial roads
  Provision of community facilities in conjunction with residential site to include community buildings, play/park facilities, school/medical facilities and minor retail outlets to enhance and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1667.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for mixed use residential, community facilities and minor on land off Marshfield Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

provide local facilities to compliment other local sustainability objectives.

Opportunity to upgrade/enhance existing village infrastructure with upgrading of local sewerage facilities through new development.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

*Representation Text: Yes.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA Recommendation</td>
<td>C2 in part of site: it is recommended that this part of the site is not developed and that green infrastructure is provided within the site to include SUDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SINC designated areas; close to SSSI: buffer areas should be created to avoid potential harm to these sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary facilities community hall and open space (inc. „various community facilities” unspecified) to be provided as part of development- suggest some employment is also provided as part of the development (this could be in the form of live/work units).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument; borders ASA: buffer areas free from development should be created if appropriate to retain the integrity and value of archaeological assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May harm potential of tourism assets including historic and environmental features: it should be ensured that the potential of the area of tourism development is investigated and realised onsite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

This land directly abuts the south east corner of the Langstone village boundary. The nursery at the site is now closed. It is not considered to be of the same urban fabric as the land and houses up Magor Road to the north.

The concerns over sewerage capacity and high landscape value are noted.

As to whether this land is needed for the Newport housing supply the Council would contend that it is not.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1668.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential development on Land at Magor Road, Langstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
0.80 HA (approx)

**Council Response:**
0.6

---

**Question: 2.5**
**Brief Description**

**Representation Text:**
Former nurseries & current market garden.

**Question: 2.6**
**Current Use**

**Representation Text:**
Market Garden.

**Question: 2.7**
**Proposed Use(s)**

**Representation Text:**
Residential.

**Question: 3.1**
**Brownfield?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Nurseries-market garden

**Council Response:**
Part of site is Brownfield

**Question: 3.10**
**Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 3.11**
**Agricultural Land?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Not Known

**Question: 3.12**
**Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Representation Text:**
Open level land immediately adjoining village development. Development would replace long established buildings and glasshouses visible from magor road.

**Council Response:**
Countryside comments: Incursion into open countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of Moderate to High value in LANDMAP. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13**
**Trees and Hedgerows?**

**Representation Text:**
No. No

**Council Response:**
TPO potential

**Question: 3.14**
**Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

**Representation Text:**
No landscape features on site. Development would relate logically to adjoining village.

**Question: 3.15**
**Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1668.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential development on Land at Magor Road, Langstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating LDP.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Part of site is Greenfield

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** The site does not seem to be within a floodzone, but is adjacent to land within zone C2

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?</td>
<td>The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. Owing to the small size of the site an off-site contribution for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</td>
<td>Public Transport passes site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Bus Route?</td>
<td>Passes site frontage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Bus Frequency?</td>
<td>Hourly (I think).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Railway Station?</td>
<td>Approx 8 Kilometers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
<td>By connection to local footpath network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Walking and Cycling?</td>
<td>on site provision and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>None known in Langstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Housing provision to round off village or in conjunction with wider adjoining development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Immediately adjoining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off
Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** Immediately adjoins village development.

**Council Response:** The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** Provide opportunity for wider development with adjoining land at Ford Farm (A & L Duthie)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1668.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential development on Land at Magor Road, Langstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** 1-3 years or 4-6 years in conjunction with land at Ford Farm.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Change to Development boundary around Langstone.
- **Council Response:** The site is outside of the settlement boundary and in land designated as Countryside.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1669.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 55/ S of Europark

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
It is recommended that only the land that is previously developed is reused for the development proposals.
- cSINCs - Spencer Works 3, Elver Pill Reen and Grassland and Pond, and Greenmoor Pool. Development on the site should seek to connect to and enhance the ecological value of the area. It is recommended that any development likely to harm the environmental designations or protected species should not be permitted.
- SSSI - Gwent Levels. Development should seek to enhance the landscape character of the area.
- Water quality should be maintained.
- Development should ensure ease of access by public transport.
- The mix of uses should ensure that a full range of community facilities is provided as part of development.
- Proposals for energy from waste should seek to minimise air pollution.
- Within The Levels ASA and within close proximity to Wilcrick Hill Fort Schedule Ancient Monument: it is recommended that development is not permitted where it may negatively affect the ASA, SAM, or Gwent Levels designations.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
The Welsh Government does not have a current intention to proceed with the new M4, and this site would represent an incursion into a sensitive landscape. There is no need in employment terms as there is a good supply of land overall, some of which is located nearby.

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

**Representation Text:**
- Land to the south of Gwent Europark

**Question: 2.2 Location**

**Representation Text:**
- Land to the south of Gwent Europark

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

**Representation Text:**
- 340431 185972

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

**Representation Text:**
- 22.16 ha

**Council Response:**
- 17.62

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for employment/business development on land to the south of Gwent Europark. Flat area of agricultural land bordered by reens and hedgerows and main access road to Llanwern Steelworks to the north west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment/Business use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Brownfield?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Agricultural Land?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Not known. Welsh Government comment: Low probability of BMV. A pre revision survey graded the site as 3c. Site is flat and climate is favourable. Soil type may lead to the site being upgraded but this would require field survey. Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The landscape is of moderate quality and entirely flat and open. However, it is dominated by the large-scale buildings of the Gwent Europark to the north and the steelworks to the north-west. Also, in due course the &quot;new M4&quot; will follow a route to the south of the site, dramatically impacting upon the landscape at this location. Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Area within proposed SLA 5 Caldicot Level. Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site layout will be designed in such a manner as to protect the integrity of the reens and their immediate margins. Buffer areas will be agreed with CCW and mitigation measures will be incorporated into the scheme design where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Representation & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

**Rep'n/Para/Policy** | **AccessnNo** | **DateLodgd** | **Late?** | **Source** | **Type** | **Mode** | **Status** | **Status Modified** | **Summary**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1669.C1 | 06/05/2009 | P | P | W | M | | | | Candidate site for employment/business development on land to the south of Gwent Europark

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Wilcrick Hill to the north believed to be a S.A.M.
- **Council Response:**
  - Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Zone C1. The proposal constitutes less vulnerable development and if the site was to be allocated as proposed the application would be supported by a FCA

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** It is adjacent to reens.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Gwent Levels SSSI

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- **Representation Text:** No. Associated with the reens, primarily invertebrates.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Yes- the capacity of the highway far exceeds the current traffic levels that use it.
- **Council Response:** yes transport assessment required
### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
It would not unless an area of open space was incorporated into the scheme design.

**Council Response:**
The Llanwern Ward has a shortfall in play space of 1.52Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
It would provide increased patronage thereby assisting the viability and sustainability of existing services.

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:**
adjacent.

**Council Response:**
500 metre

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:**
Not known.

**Council Response:**
1-2 hour freq

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:**
Newport (4 miles); Chepstow (4 miles).

**Council Response:**
newport station

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:**
2 miles at Magor village centre.

**Council Response:**
ringland district centre 7km
magor square 2.3km

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

**Representation Text:**
Very accessible to Gwent Europark, the Steelworks, Chepstow and Newport.

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

**Representation Text:**
By providing appropriate physical links to the existing external network.

**Council Response:**
on site facilities

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1669.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for employment/business development on land to the south of Gwent Europark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. A 'Public Access' route skirts the southern edge of the site.
- **Council Response:** There is no adopted PROW on this site

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- **Representation Text:** At Magor - Schools, Village Halls, Shops etc.
- **Council Response:** Yes.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- **Representation Text:** By increasing the range of local job opportunities.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- **Representation Text:** Adjacent

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
- **Representation Text:** Only during construction - some noise, dust and disturbance.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
- **Representation Text:** Although it may need to be upgraded.
- **Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.
Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelwork’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements begin undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
Representation Text:
Yes. Site sits adjacent to one residential property only - Greenmoor Farm.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
Representation Text:
On development of the new M4 the site will be physically annexed from the remainder of the levels landscape to the south and east. At that point it will be more appropriately physically and visually related to the Europark site to the north.

Council Response:
The site is adjacent to settlement boundary
### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

**Representation Text:** It will add no particular new pressure. However, it will assist in sustaining the viability of the whole locality.

### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

**Representation Text:** No. Agent

### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?

**Representation Text:** Yes. 1-3 years of adoption of the LDP

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:** No. It would merely need to be allocated as proposed.

**Council Response:** The site is within the Countryside designation and M4 Relief Road protected route and buffer

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 9 Map Included?

**Representation Text:** Yes.
1670 Pennine Property Investments Limited

**Rep'n/Para/Policy** | **AccessnNo** | **DateLodgd** | **Lat?** | **Source** | **Type** | **Mode** | **Status** | **Status Modified** | **Summary**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
1670.C1 | | 06/05/2009 | P | P | W | M | | | Summary: Candidate site for mixed use development including residential, employment, retail and leisure on Carcraft site

**Site:** B/ Carcraft

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

**Question** | **Representation Texts**
---|---
**Question:** SA Recommendation
---|---
**Council Response:**
- Green infrastructure could be used to enhance the ecological value of the site.
- Housing should be located as far from road infrastructure as possible as part of the mix of uses.

**Question:** Overall Council Response
---|---
**Council Response:**
- Originally built for employment purposes, the site later changed to car sales. While potential changes to this type of trading are recognised, the site is not considered suitable for residential use, and no allocation is proposed. If it should become available, any applications for reuse should be considered under the relevant policies of the plan.

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name
---|---
**Representation Text:** Carcraft Site

**Question:** 2.2 Location
---|---
**Representation Text:** Langland Way, Spytty Road, Newport NP19 4PT

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference
---|---
**Representation Text:** E: 333230 N: 186621
**Council Response:** 325674 183177

**Question:** 2.4 Site Area
---|---
**Representation Text:** The total site area is 5.9 hectares (14.7 acres)

**Question:** 2.5 Brief Description
---|---
The site is appropriately located within the settlement boundary, to the east of the River Usk and some 1.5 miles to the south-east of Newport City centre. The land is split into two sites, intersected by Langland Way, both fronting Spytty Road. The main sales site extends to approximately 5.0 hectares (12.5 acres) and accommodated a large steel framed industrial building of some 105,154 sq ft (9,769 sq m) which is used as the car showroom sales area with ancillary office accommodation on the ground and first floor. Adjacent to the main sales area is a smaller detached building extending to some 3,154 sq ft (293 sq m) which is used as a vehicle maintenance workshop. The remainder of the site is surfaced car parking. The smaller site extends to 0.9 hectares (2.2 acres) and accommodates a detached steel framed industrial building of some 41,086 sq ft (3,817 sq m) which had been used for the maintenance of motor vehicles.

**Question:** 2.6 Current Use
---|---

16/02/2012
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Summary: Candidate site for mixed use development including residential, employment, retail and leisure
on Carcraft site

Representation No: 1670.C1
Date Lodged: 06/05/2009
Accession No: P W MP

Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
Representation Text: It is considered that the site represents a significant opportunity for a mixed use
development which could include residential (including student and elderly accommodation),
employment, retail and leisure uses.

Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
Representation Text: Yes. The site is currently used as a car sales showroom and associated vehicle
maintenance buildings.

Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
Representation Text: The site lies to the north of an existing industrial estate (Reevesland Industrial
Estate) and has frontage onto Spytty Road. Given the industrial uses to the south it is considered that
the redevelopment of the site could help to improve the quality and appearance of the local landscape and
environment.

Council Response: Countryside comments: No broad countryside issues. Site specifics would have to be
considered, trees visual impact ecology etc. development on site could make more positive visual
contribution to SDR road corridor with greater level of planting etc.

Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Trees around the perimeter, TPO potential.

Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
Representation Text: The site does not contain any known biodiversity or landscape features worthy of retention.

Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1670.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for mixed use development including residential, employment, retail and leisure on Carcraft site

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No. The site is previously developed brownfield land within an established urban area.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No. There are no known or suspected causes of contamination at the site. This can be confirmed as part of the planning application process. Should any risk of contamination be identified at the site a suitable mitigation strategy can be implemented to deal with any risk that had not been identified to date.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. The site lies within Flood Risk Zone C1 as defined by the Environment Agency's TAN15 Development Advice Maps. Accordingly, any planning application will be supported by a Flood Consequences Assessment (FCA) which will determine the suitability and acceptability of development opportunities at the site. Flood risk can therefore be dealt with as part of the development control process.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
- **Council Response:**
  - Listed building n/a
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park n/a
  - conservation area n/a
  - Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodge</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1670.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for mixed use development including residential, employment, retail and leisure on Carcraft site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
The site is located immediately to the south of Spytty Road leading into Newport's City centre. This is a dual carriageway and the highway network in this area is robust and more than capable of accommodating and supporting the level of traffic associated with the proposed redevelopment of the site. Any planning application could be accompanied by a Transport Assessment to demonstrate capacity and safety.

**Council Response:**
Yes. Good access to SDR. Proposed mixed use not known. Capacity issues not anticipated. Transport assessment required.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
This matter would be addressed as part of the planning application process but linkages to the adjacent leisure facilities could potentially be improved as part of the redevelopment of the site.

**Council Response:**
The proposed development falls within the Lliswerry Ward that has a shortfall in Informal Play of 2.24Ha and Equipped Play of 2.94Ha. Owing to the close proximity of the site to Newport International Sports Village an off site contribution for the upgrading of local facilities would be required.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
This matter would also be addressed as part of the planning application process but linkages to bus services could potentially be improved as part of the redevelopment of the site.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
The site is well served by public transport infrastructure with bus stops in the east and west bound directions along Spytty Road which are served by 3 local bus routes providing access to and from the City centre and the wider area.

**Council Response:**
adjacent to site

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
There are typically six buses per hour operating on the Spytty Road and Corporation Road during the day, including the route from Newport to Moorland Park via Spytty Road.

**Council Response:**
very good 10-20 min service on SDR. Bus stop provision on SDR poor

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
It is approximately 3km to Newport's central train station.

**Council Response:**
Newport station 2.8km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
There is an Aldi store some 800 metres east of the site to the south of the Nash Road roundabout and the Newport Retail Park (which consists of a mix of food and non-food retail uses) is located some 1,200 metres east of the site adjacent to Spytty Road. There are also a range of shops including general stores and newsagents on Corporation Road some 800 metres to the north of the site.

**Council Response:**
newport retail park 1.6km
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1670.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for mixed use development including residential, employment, retail and leisure on Carcraft site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

Representation Text:
- The site lies adjacent to an existing industrial estate (Reevesland Industrial Estate) where there is a range of employment uses and within close proximity to the residential area of Liswerry with its range of community services, including the Newport International Sports Village which has a number of sporting facilities including Newport Stadium, the Wales National Velodrome, Swimming Pool, and a Tennis centre.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

Representation Text:
- To the east of the site along Spytty Road and to the western side of the Nash Road roundabout, there is a footbridge providing the route to the residential areas to the north of Spytty Road. The site would be accessible on foot and by cycle which is consistent with national policy. The site's accessibility could be improved as part of the redevelopment of the site by providing safe, well lit surfaces for pedestrian and cyclists and providing cycle storage areas.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

Representation Text:
- No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

Representation Text:
- Spytty Park Leisure Centre and associated sports facilities lie approximately 700 metres to the east of the site.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

Representation Text:
- Yes. The site is well related to local schools and colleges. The Liswerry junior and infant school is located some 600 metres to the north-east of the site, whilst the St Andrews infant school and the local library are some 800 metres to the north-west of the site. To the east of the site, and south of Spytty Road are Liswerry High School and the Newport Campus for Coleg Gwent located on Nash Road, together with a range of community facilities including the leisure centre and sports village.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

Representation Text:
- No. At this early stage, no consultation has been undertaken with the local community.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

Representation Text:
- The redevelopment of the site could provide substantial benefits to the local community by means of potential job creation and environmental improvements, with no loss of any community resources.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Representation Text:
- No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

Representation Text:
- Corporation road district centre 1.2km

Council Response:
- on site provision and infrastructure linking onto sdr cycle route.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1670.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for mixed use development including residential, employment, retail and leisure on Carcraft site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

- No.

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

- Yes. The site is already fully served by these services and there should be sufficient capacity for the proposed redevelopment of the site but this will obviously need to be confirmed by the service providers.

**Welsh Water Comments Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water Supply**

It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. Any upgrade of this asset will likely be considerably expensive. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

- Yes. The site presents a significant redevelopment opportunity for a mixed use development scheme that could incorporate, amongst others, residential and employment uses. The detailed design and juxtaposition of the land uses will be carefully considered as part of the planning application process and will ensure that the proposed uses on the site are compatible.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

- The site performs well against the tests set out in national Planning Policy Wales and especially the search sequence - it is made up of previously developed or used land within the settlement boundary. Its allocation for mixed use development would help to improve the performance of the LDP by reducing the need for new greenfield land releases and increasing the proportion of development that can be accommodated on vacant previously developed land in an inherently urban and sustainable location.

**Council Response:**

The site is within the settlement boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
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### Representation 1670.C1

**Summary:** Candidate site for mixed use development including residential, employment, retail and leisure on Carcraft site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1670.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for mixed use development including residential, employment, retail and leisure on Carcraft site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

Each application should be treated on its own merits as per normal planning protocols. However, it is not anticipated that the redevelopment of the site would add to pressures for redevelopment of any nearby sites as it is not allocated for any specific land use within the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan and is therefore 'white' land.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** No. GVA Grimley Limited is the planning agent acting on behalf of the owner of the site.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The development timescales will be dependent upon the planning process and any associated local infrastructure improvements which may be required. However, it is expected that these matters can be resolved to allow development to take place within the 1-3 year time period.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** No. As the site lies wholly within the defined urban development limit and is not allocated for any specific land use within the adopted Unitary Development Plan, the site's allocation for mixed use development would not require any change to the boundary or designation in the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

**Council Response:** The site is white land, within the settlement boundary.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** CHANGE OF USE TO VEHICLE SALES AND ANCILLARY USES TO INCLUDE OFFICES, CAR STORAGE AND REPAIR WORKSHOPS AND DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDINGS.

95/0163 05/05/1995 Granted with Conditions.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.
1. In summary, and as previously submitted as part of the major candidate sites consultation, the site offers a significant opportunity to contribute to the supply of previously developed land within the urban area.

2. In terms of accessibility, the site is within an existing urban area and is well related to the established residential area of Liswerry and in close proximity to existing schools, shops and community facilities. The site is also close to several bus routes linking it to Newport City centre. It is evident from the assessment of the site that it satisfies the site selection criteria for residential development as defined by Planning Policy Wales.

3. Due to a number of factors, including the current downturn in the economy, the number of cars stored at the site has been reduced and are now solely displayed within the showroom. The number of staff employed has also been substantially reduced and the sites as a whole are therefore significantly underused. The internet is also expected to play a greater role in the future sales of second hand cars. Consequently, there is going to be a change in how the industry will sell second hand cars which will result in the need for smaller sales rooms and larger central storage areas. There is limited demand for this size (greater than 4,645 sq m/50,000 sq ft) and type of industrial unit in this area.

4. In a nutshell, intelligence about the site's potential confirms that redevelopment can take place and that there are few constraints to delivery. The site can therefore be relied upon to perform its expected role. This is important given the clear guidance given to authorities about the allocations of land in the Local Development Plan, Paragraph 2.16 of the Local Development Plans Wales (2005), which states: "By identifying sites for development and areas of restraint, an authority demonstrates how the vision and strategy in the plan will be implemented in practical terms. The identification of sites for specific uses (including mixed uses) should be founded on a robust and credible assessment of the suitability and availability of land for particular uses or a mix of uses and the probability that it will be developed."

5. In light of this guidance, we strongly contend that the site should be allocated for uses for which there is a known need and this site would certainly perform well as a mixed use allocation which includes new housing and other forms of residential accommodation (including the provision for a retirement and/or care home and student accommodation), employment, leisure and retail uses.
### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
- PROW 401 at Sloblands site: effect should be minimised through avoiding PROW or ensuring their retention/no negative effects.
- Part of the site is within the SSSI Gwent levels - Nash and Goldcliff, Council Alpha Steel and Solutia Site- recommend site boundary be redrawn to be at least 2km away from this, or appropriate potential for mitigation proved.
- TAN 15 DAM's will shortly be updated and will clarify the position - it is suggested that this site allocation be reviewed upon publication of TAN15 updates.
- Convenience shop has been deemed „not applicable“. It is recommended that this is revisited as local facilities will be required for staff at employment sites/part of the mix of uses could potentially include convenient retail if required.
- Directly adjacent to the Nash/Goldcliff coastal zone historic landscape character area of the Gwent Levels - likely to have a negative effect on the landscape character - site is characterised including abundant archaeological remains, which may be affected negatively by development adjacent.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
As a largely brownfield site within the urban area, reuse for other purposes could be considered under the policies of the plan. In the absence of specific proposals, and in view of the various constraints that could affect delivery, no formal allocation is proposed.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:**
- Land known as the "Sloblands" (adjacent to Alphasteel site)

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:**
- Corporation Road, Uskmouth, Newport

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**
- E: 333772 N:184599

**Council Response:**
- 333967 184556

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:**
- Approximately 55 hectares

**Council Response:**
- 54.28

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

**Representation Text:**
- Relatively flat site that comprises land historically used for the landfill operations associated with the adjacent steelworks.
### Question: 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:**  
Vacant

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:**  
Mixed-use employment led development, where the following uses could be achieved:  
- General business, warehousing and industry;  
- Rail related business activity;  
- Potentially landfill (to level existing lagoons on site);  
- Waste and waste recycling/transfer;  
- Energy production (including micro generation); and  
- Other civic and commercial uses

Further information is provided in Section 8.0

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:**  
Yes. Previously used as a landfill site by the adjacent steelworks.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:**  
No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:**  
No.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:**  
The area comprises previously developed land within an area characterised by industrial development. Redevelopment would not be intrusive given the general industrial land uses within the surrounding area and could improve the existing environment.

**Council Response:**  
Countryside comments:  
Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Area within proposed SLA. 5 Caldicot Level. Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:**  
Yes. Various trees and hedgerows are located along the perimeter of the site (and within it), although none are known to be protected.

**Council Response:**  
No TPOs on site  
SSSI with hedgerows. TPO potential.

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**  
This would be dealt with as part of the planning application process and through appropriate design. Improvements to the condition of the Sloblands could well result in improvements to the value of the site.
### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**

Candidate site for mixed-use employment led development on land known as the 'Sloblands'.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:** No. No known sites exist or have been discovered.

**Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment:** In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** Yes. It is known that the site was previously used for the landfill of waste associated with adjacent steel works. Redevelopment would fully address contamination and provide suitable remediation where necessary.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Currently shown as Zone C1 flood risk area. Area is known to benefit from significant flood defences along the River Usk and recent development has taken place at the adjoining power station without objection from the EA. The TAN 15 DAM's will shortly be updated and will clarify the position.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Site is bounded to the south by Julian's Reen, with the River Usk lying beyond the western boundary of the steelworks that lie to the west of the Sloblands site.

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No. Relatively flat site. Past uses and current conditions are likely to influence activities on the site. However, these provide opportunities as well as constraints.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Part of the site is within the SSSI Gwent levels -Nash and Goldcliff, Alpha Steel and Solutia Site

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** No. Recent development proposals in the surrounding area show that development can take place without impact on any protected species.

**Council Response:** There are species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
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Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1673.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for mixed-use employment led development on land known as the "Sloblands"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listed building n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historic park n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conservation area n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Newport boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

Representation Text: No. Depending on the type of use and activity improvements may be required to the site's accessibility. A number of options exist to achieve this which range from local improvements and projects, to those associated with a wider arc of opportunity at Uskmouth. The New M4 road would also provide improved access, although site is capable of development with or without the new M4.

Council Response: The site is considered to be accessible for the public highway via Picked Lane which unsuitable for any additional traffic. Site divorced from existing Industrial area by railway line. Land does have any other access to public highway. Significant new highway infrastructure required full Traffic Assessment needed.

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

Representation Text: Not applicable

Council Response: The proposed development falls within the Lliswerry Ward that has a shortfall in Informal Play of 2.24Ha and Equipped Play of 2.94Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site its isolated position and size would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

Representation Text: Not applicable.

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

Representation Text: See below

Council Response: 750 metes via narrow unlit, no footway lane.

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

Representation Text: Bus route is accessible at West Nash Community Centre - approximately 500 metres to the west of site. Further services are also available to the north at Corporation Road.

Council Response: very poor 1-2 hour service. New rerouted service required

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

Representation Text: Site is rail served.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1673.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for mixed-use employment led development on land known as the “Sloblands”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newport City Council Local Development Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

- Representation Text: Not applicable.
- Council Response: Newport station 7.5km

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- Representation Text: Employment led development is proposed which would create jobs for the wider community.
- Council Response: Newport retail park 3.4km

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

- Representation Text: Would be dealt with as part of the planning application process.
- Council Response: On site provision and infrastructure

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: PROW 401 401/9

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- Representation Text: Newport Wetlands Reserve lies approximately 500 metres to the south of the site.
- Council Response: There is an equipped playing space on St Marys Road, and a formal space on St Marys Road - Nash Playground

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

- Representation Text: No. Not applicable. Proposed use is employment led in nature with no requirement for access to schools or community facilities.
- Council Response: No

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: No

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

- Representation Text: The proposals put forward for redevelopment of the site would provide employment generation for the local community and wider area.
- Council Response: No

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: No

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

- Representation Text:
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Summary: Candidate site for mixed-use employment led development on land known as the ‘Sloblands’.

The adjacent Alphasteel works and surrounding industrial premises are served by these services, which could be extended to serve the site.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text:
Yes. Possible impact could include noise, small and traffic dependant upon the mix of uses developed. However, the site is isolated from sensitive neighbouring uses making it an ideal location for uses that may create these impacts.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text:
Yes.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. Any upgrade of this asset will likely be considerably expensive. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text:
Yes. Closest residential properties are located at Little Cross Farm - approximately 350 metres from the site boundary. Nash Village is the nearest cluster of residential properties approximately 250 metres to the south of the southern perimeters of the site.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text:
Development would be an extension of the industrial/employment uses associated with the surrounding area.

Council Response:
The development could form part of a wider development opportunity for the surrounding area. It could also act as part of a cluster of businesses using/producing or relying on green technology or energy.

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text:

Council Response:
The site is predominantly within the settlement boundary, the remaining section is directly adjacent to the settlement boundary.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

16/02/2012
Summary: Candidate site for mixed-use employment led development on land known as the 'Sloblands'.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
Representation Text: No. Agent, acting on behalf of the owner of the site.

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?
Representation Text: Yes. The development timescales will be dependent upon the planning process and the associated local infrastructure improvements. However, it is expected that these matters can be resolved to allow development to take place within the 4-6 year period.

Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?
Representation Text: No. Site lies within the defined urban boundary limit and is unallocated - i.e. white land
Council Response: The site is predominantly within the settlement boundary current white land, the remaining is directly adjacent to the settlement boundary and is allocated as countryside.

Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Relevant Planning History on adjoining sites:
- 08/0296 BIOTREATMENT PLANT TO TREAT EFFLUENT WASTEWATER FROM TWO PROCESS PLANTS COMPRISING 3 BALANCE TANKS AND BIOREACTOR SOLUTIA UK LTD TRASTON ROAD
- 08/1412 ERECTION OF 2NO. WIND TURBINES, ACCESS TRACKS, TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION COMPOUND, SWITCHGEAR HOUSE, HARDSTANDING AREA AND CABLING (AMENDMENT TO PERMISSION 06/1466) SOLUTIA UK LTD TRASTON ROAD

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text: 1 INTRODUCTION
1.1 The information in this brief statement supplements the completed questionnaire above and follows the main headlines contained in the questionnaire.

1.2 This statement has been prepared by GVA Grimley Limited on behalf of Technoplan Ltd (TL). TL is promoting the allocation of land known as the 'Sloblands' which sits to the east of the River Usk, as a candidate site for inclusion in the emerging Newport Local Development Plan (LDP).

2 SITE DETAILS AND PROPOSED USES

2.1 The site extends to approximately 55 hectares and comprises land that has historically been used in connection with the nearby (Alpha) steelworks. However, the site is no longer in active use and is now available for independent activities and uses (either on its own or as part of a wider initiative involving other land to the north and south in the wider Uskmouth area).

2.2 The Sloblands site is located approximately 4km south east of Newport City Centre, east of the Alpha Steel Works and north east of Uskmouth power station. Significant new development is either taking place (at the power station) or is proposed (around the Solutia Plant where the new M4 may also pass). The site itself comprises a number of raised reservoirs previously used in conjunction with a former aluminium smelting plant located on the site of the Alpha Steel Works. Areas of dry land are also present.

2.3 The western boundary of the site is formed by the operational railway line which serves businesses along the east bank of the Usk. To the north lies the Solutia Chemical Works and to the south lies Welsh Water's treatment works and the Uskmouth power station complex, where a new 850mw facility is currently being developed. To the east are the Gwent levels.

2.4 Over the LDP time period, and quite possibly during the early stages of the plan, the Sloblands site is likely to come forward for alternative uses and redevelopment. Its location and characteristics mean that the site is suitable for a mixed use, and if necessary or appropriate, 'specialised' or 'civic' employment led allocation in the UDP. Previous submissions to the LDP have recommended that the following forms of development could be achieved at the site:

- General business, warehousing and industry;
- Rail related business activity;
- Potentially landfill (to level the existing lagoons);
- Waste and waste recycling / transfer;
- Energy production (including micro generation); and
- Other civic and commercial uses.

2.5 As set out above, the Sloblands site could be developed in isolation or in conjunction with other land in the Uskmouth Area. The site and the area could provide an ideal location for a range of 'green' employment uses as well as other more general business uses, which could be attracted to the area because of the readily available locally generated power supplies, existing rail links in the area and the absence of sensitive neighbours.

2.6 Such development is supported by current planning Policy. Indeed, Planning Policy Wales (PPW) states the following in terms of the green economy, business and social clusters and enterprises.
3 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

3.1 The Sloblands has been comprehensively used in the past. During the 1970s the area accommodated 8 raised lagoons, 3 of which have now been in-filled with waste material primarily generated at the Alpha steel works site. To accommodate this waste the site was a registered hazardous waste landfill site. Whilst filling could continue with more inert waste, it is therefore likely that at least parts of the site contain land with ground conditions that will need to be tackled if new uses and activities are to take place there. However, this in turn means that these new uses and activities present an important opportunity to address ground conditions in a positive and comprehensive manner. This is one reason why national planning policy asks local planning authorities to pursue and prioritise the recycling of used or damaged land before more straightforward or Greenfield areas are used.

3.2 In terms of flood risk, the site lies to the east of the River Usk and is currently located within Zone C1 according to the TAN 15 Development Advice Maps. However, much of the east bank of the Usk has been subject to flood defence works and it is likely that the DAM will shortly be reviewed. In the meantime, the site is well served by flood defence infrastructure and any development proposals would be supported by a Flood Consequences Assessment as part of the planning application process. Recent development schemes and approvals for them indicate that flooding will not present a constraint to development of the Sloblands.

3.3 Full investigations, and where required, mitigation will therefore be undertaken as part of any future development of this land. The planning process is robust in the assessment of both flood risk and contamination and it is expected that these matters will form a central part of any planning application that is submitted for the site.

3.4 Beyond these two issues, the site is relatively flat in nature and does not have any known topographical or stability issues that would prevent its development. The remaining lagoons have a stable water level and once water is extracted could be suitable for further landfill which could in turn create a series of development platforms or parcels. As a result the site could offer a double opportunity – whereby waste could be taken and used as a foundation for future beneficial development. This makes the Sloblands a truly sustainable development opportunity.

3.5 The site itself is not subject to any environmental protection designations and there are no known protected species at the site. The site lies to the east of the River Usk (which is a designated SSSI and SAC). However, the site is buffered from the River by the Alphas Steelworks and experience suggests that any impact on the SSSI or...
Summary: Candidate site for mixed-use employment led development on land known as the ‘Sloblands’ SAC will be minimal and can be managed. Indeed, successful development and subsequent land management may well present opportunities for an improved relationship with the surrounding area. This is true for the land to the east as well – which is also protected and where Gwent Wildlife Trust is currently active. These matters will be confirmed as part of the planning application process and where appropriate remediation and mitigation can be included as part of the development process in order to improve the existing situation, thus leading to potential environmental improvements to the wider area.

3.6 The general area surrounding the site is industrial in nature with a range of heavy industrial land uses in the wider area, including the Alpha steelworks immediately to the west and the waste water treatment works to the south. Further development in this area will therefore not be intrusive in the local landscape.

3.7 The development of the Sloblands site will be fully consistent with national policy guidance that places preference on the re-use of previously developed land and will secure remediation of the site.

4.0 ACCESS

4.1 Depending on the uses and activities proposed, the site could well require improved access arrangements in order to allow its full potential to be realised. However, these improvements are considered to be easily deliverable, with a number of options available to provide access to the site. Improved access arrangements could also have the benefit of unlocking a wider arc of opportunity at Uskmouth which could stretch through the Sloblands to the water treatment works and to the power station.

4.2 It should also be noted that the profile and importance of the site could be significantly changed with the development of the new M4. One of only two junctions on the motorway is proposed to the north of Sloblands. This could act as an additional catalyst to the future development of the site.

4.3 It is acknowledged that the site is relatively remote in terms of its proximity to public transport infrastructure, with there being limited bus and train services for public access to the site. Whilst improvements could be made to the sites connection with such infrastructure as part of any future development proposals and, again, this is not critical to the site’s acceptability or performance. Some uses and activities need to be in peripheral locations where modal choice is inevitably limited and is unlikely to improve. Despite this however, because of the overall centrality of some land to the catchment or purpose it serves and because of other attributes (for example the availability of land to be rail served – which very few sites can hope to ever offer unless there is an existing railway line nearby), then these sites can in fact be more sustainable. They may also be the only or best sites that are genuinely available for the uses proposed. All of these tests are passed at Uskmouth.

4.4 In addition, the development opportunities provided by the site are employment generating in nature and will therefore offer the opportunity for new job creations for the local community.

5.0 COMMUNITY ISSUES

5.1 As set out above, the site is relatively (but unapologetically) remote from surrounding houses, schools or community facilities. It does however lie very close to the edge of Newport and, as the UDP makes clear, falls within the existing urban boundary set
for the City. Given the nature of the proposed development opportunity, this is clearly a positive attribute of the site. Large scale employment uses such as those put forward for consideration at the Sloblands site need to be separated from neighbours that will affect operations, but need to be close enough to allow employees and materials to reach them quickly (and over short distances. It is therefore a consequence that development of this nature will not be as closely linked to existing communities and facilities as other forms of development.

6.0 INFRASTRUCTURE AND CONTEXT
6.1 The surrounding area is served by existing water, sewerage, electricity, gas and telecommunications services. The site lies adjacent to the Alpha steel works and to the north of Uskmouth power station, which are fully served in terms of infrastructure provision.

6.2 As stated above, the site is set back from any clusters of residential properties, with the nearest individual properties being located approximately 300 metres to the east and south of the perimeter of the site (with any significant clusters of residential development being much further away). It is therefore considered that a range of employment uses could be developed at the site without detriment to any sensitive surrounding land uses.

7.0 LAND OWNERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES
7.1 We can confirm that the site is within the ownership of Technoplan Limited and that there are no known constraints or restrictions that would prevent its development over the LDP period.

Question: 9 Map Included?

Representation Text: Yes.
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### Site: 66/ Uskmouth Power Station

### Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites

#### Question: SA Recommendation

- **Council Response:** PROW 401 at Sloblands site: effect should be minimised through avoiding PROW or ensuring their retention/no negative effects.
- Part of the site is within the SSSI Gwent levels -Nash and Goldcliff, Council Alpha Steel and Solutia Site- recommend site boundary be redrawn to be at least 2km away from this, or appropriate potential for mitigation proved.
- TAN 15 DAM's will shortly be updated and will clarify the position- it is suggested that this site allocation be reviewed upon publication of TAN15 updates.
- Convenience shop has been deemed „not applicable”. It is recommended that this is re-visited as local facilities will be required for staff at employment sites/part of the mix of uses could potentially include convenient retail if required.
- Directly adjacent to the Nash/Goldcliff coastal zone historic landscape character area of the Gwent Levels - likely to have a negative effect on the landscape character - site is characterised including abundant archaeological remains, which may be affected negatively by development adjacent.

#### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:** As a brownfield site within the urban boundary, the uses proposed could be considered under the policies of the plan. Allocation for particular uses is not proposed in view of the lack of specific proposals and the consequent inability to assess their potential impacts. The current use of the site is, however, noted.

#### Question: 2.1 Site Name

** Representation Text:** Uskmouth Power Station (and surrounding land)

#### Question: 2.2 Location

** Representation Text:** West Nash Road, Newport, NP18 2BZ

#### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

** Representation Text:** E:332867 N:183783

**Council Response:** 332768 183700

#### Question: 2.4 Site Area

** Representation Text:** Approximately 80 hectares

**Council Response:** 82.88

#### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

** Representation Text:** Broadly flat site that comprises the existing Power Station and adjacent land within the ownership of Welsh Power UK Ltd.
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**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

**Representation Text:**

- Power Station (and surrounding land)

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

**Representation Text:**

- Mixed use employment development, that could comprise the following uses:
  - Energy production;
  - Rail related business;
  - Waste recycling;
  - Waste to energy facilities;
  - General business and industry;
  - New roads and infrastructure;
  - Civic and institutional uses; and
  - Other mixed/commercial uses.

Further information is provided in Section 8.0

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Uskmouth Power Station (and surrounding land).

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

**Representation Text:**

- No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Representation Text:**

- The site and surrounding area comprises the power station and surrounding industrial uses, as well as the water treatment works. Development would not be intrusive given the general industrial land uses within the surrounding area. As stated already, recent projects demonstrate the ability of the surrounding area to accommodate significant development and change.

**Council Response:**

- Countryside comments:
  - Development constraints related to River Usk SSSI, SAC Severn SPA and SAC, Gwent levels SSSI and wetlands NNR all adjacent to site.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Various trees and hedgerows are located to the perimeter of the site, although none are known to be protected

**Council Response:**

- There are no TPOs on the site
  - SSSI with hedgerows. TPO potential.
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**Summary:** Candidate Site for mixed use employment development at Uskmouth Power Station (and surrounding land)

**Question:** 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:** This would be dealt with as part of the planning application process and through appropriate design.

**Question:** 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:** No. No known sites exist or have been discovered.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question:** 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question:** 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** No. No known contamination at site. Recent development projects have demonstrated that any ground condition issues could be addressed.

**Question:** 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Zone C1 flood risk area. Area is known to benefit from significant flood defences along the River Usk and recent development of power station has taken place without objection from the EA.

**Question:** 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Site lies on the eastern bank of the River Usk.

**Question:** 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No. Relatively flat site with no issues preventing its development.

**Question:** 3.7 SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No. The River Usk to the west of the site is a SSSI and SAC – this lies outside of the site area. Recent development projects show that significant change can take place at Uskmouth without impact on the SSI/SAC

**Council Response:** Adjacent to Julians Gout Land, Nature Reserve, Severn Estuary and River Usk SSSI - SAC -RAMSAR & SPA

**Question:** 3.8 Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** No. Recent development projects show that significant change can take place at Uskmouth without detrimental impact to any protected species. Where required, suitable mitigation
### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:**
Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
Historic park n/a
Conservation area n/a

**Within Newport boundary**

**Council Response:**
There are species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Existing highways arrangements can be utilised, although major redevelopment of this area could also trigger enhanced infrastructure and highway connections. Access arrangements can be achieved either with or without the proposed new M4 relief road. (See additional comments in Section 8 for more information).

**Council Response:**
Yes west north road and north road narrow
No footway or street lighting. Existing Usk road/ west- Mall road poor geometry.
Proposed uses unknow- transport asessment required.

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
The proposed development falls within the Lliswerry Ward that has a shortfall in Informal Play of 2.24Ha and Equipped Play of 2.94Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site its isolated position and size would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Council Response:**
Not applicable

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
Not applicable

**Council Response:**

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:**
Bus route is accessible at West Nash Community centre, located approximately 400 metres to the east of the site.

**Council Response:**
2km

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:**
Very poor 1-2 hour service

**Council Response:**

---
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**Question: 4.4** Railway Station?
- **Representation Text:** Not applicable
- **Council Response:** newport station 9km

**Question: 4.5** Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** Not applicable
- **Council Response:** newport retail park 7.4km

**Question: 4.6** Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** Employment led development is proposed as part of this candidate site submission which would create jobs for the wider community. The surrounding area also comprises a broad range of industrial premises and associated employment.

**Question: 4.7** Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** This would be dealt with as part of the planning application process.
- **Council Response:** On site provision and infrastructure linking onto Usk cycle route on West usk Road.

**Question: 4.8** Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** 401/2 OUTSIDE THE SITE, ALONG THE BOUNDARY

**Question: 4.9** Open Space?
- **Representation Text:** Newport Wetlands Reserve lies approximately 200 metres to the south of the site.
- **Council Response:** There is an equipped playing space on St Marys Road, and a formal space on St Marys Road - Nash Playground

**Question: 5.1** Schools?
- **Representation Text:** Not applicable. The proposed use is of an employment led nature with no requirements for access to schools or community facilities.

**Question: 5.2** Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.3** Community Aspirations?
- **Representation Text:** The proposals detailed in this candidate site representation envisage employment generating uses that would benefit the local community and wider area.
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Summary: Candidate Site for mixed use employment development at Uskmouth Power Station (and surrounding land)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Site is already served by these services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. Possible impacts could include noise, smell and traffic – although these will be dependant upon the mix of uses developed at the site. However, the site is isolated from sensitive neighbouring uses making it an ideal location for uses that may have impacts such as these.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Response:

**Welsh Water Comments**

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. Any upgrade of this asset will likely be considerably expensive. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Yes. The closest residential property is located at Moorcroft farm, which is approximately 700 metres from the site. There are no large clusters of houses within close proximity to the site. Furthermore, proximity to housing was considered when the new power station facility was approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text: Development would be an extension of the industrial / employment uses associated with the existing power station (and surrounding uses).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Response: The site is within the settlement boundary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1674.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
Representation Text:
The development of the site could open up development opportunities for related employment uses in the wider area. It could also act as part of a cluster of businesses using, producing or relying on green technology or energy.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
Representation Text:
Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
Representation Text:
No. Agent - Acting on behalf of the owner of the site.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
Representation Text:
No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
Representation Text:
No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
Representation Text:
No. The development timescales will be dependant upon the planning process and, if appropriate or necessary, local infrastructure improvements. However, it is expected that these matters can be resolved to allow development to take place within the 1 – 3 year time period (and certainly within the 4-6 year period).

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
Representation Text:
No. The site lies within the defined urban boundary limit and is unallocated - i.e white land.
Council Response:
The site is within the settlement boundary and is allocated as white land.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
Representation Text:
No.
Council Response:
CONSTRUCTION OF SEA DEFENCES AS PART OF THE CALDICOT LEVELS SEA DEFENCE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT
06/0808 29-Aug-2006 GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS
PUBLIC PROTECTION MANAGER – No objection
GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST -No objection
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY – Requested conditions
CCW – No response
LEVELS DRAINAGE BOARD – No objection subject to conditions

MOVEMENT AND RE-USE OF PULVERISED FUEL ASH FOR THE PURPOSE OF LAND RESTORATION AND CREATION OF LANDSCAPED MOUNDS
06/1176 03-Apr-2007 GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: Objects. A full Transport Assessment has not been carried out in accordance with Department of Transport or Institute of Highways and Transportation’s guidelines. The accident study assessment has not been carried out in sufficient depth nor includes any effect on cycling. The assessment assumes a carriageway width of 7.3m which is incorrect for the highways in the area are significantly narrower. The assessment confirms 8,000 cubic metres of topsoil will need to be imported to the site and equates this to 200 journeys, ie 40 tonnes per journey, whilst the export of waste off-site of 2,800 cubic metres equates to 150 journeys, ie 19 tonnes per journey and the removal of all PFA off-site of 150,000 cubic metres equates to 15,000 journeys or 10 tonnes per journey. The applicant appears to amend the tonnage of import/export to suit his argument. Consistency of size of vehicle must be used to enable an equitable comparison to be considered. The use of rail directly into the site would be preferable for both delivery of large equipment and topsoil. If this is not feasible then road access is the only alternative. However, should you be minded to recommend this application for approval a Section 59 Agreement of the Highways Act 1980 will be required to recover the cost of expenses due to extraordinary traffic. This agreement will need to be the subject of a Section 106 Planning Agreement to ensure that it is entered into. A condition to any approval should also be applied requiring the submission of a transportation access method statement to include routes, times of delivery, protection of cyclists, etc. This must be provided for approval and implemented prior to any works commencing on site.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES: No objection to information provided.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (LANDSCAPE OFFICER): Further photomontages are required that clearly show the site area. These should be closer to the site than the East Usk lighthouse and evenly spread to the south east, east and west. The landscape assessment text must be amended to include reference to findings of “Landscaes Working for Newport”, reference to and any impact on Register of Historic Landscapes in Wales, inclusion of proposed 3m visual bund on periphery of the site, possible benefits of this development including screening of existing power station and ancillary works, reference to area as a landscape with high to outstanding visual quality. If the principles of design are followed through does not doubt that the intrusion of this development into the landscape will be minimised. During construction phases this will not be the case and the mitigation should discuss timescales, progressive restoration, advanced planting and construction phase impacts in greater detail.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (BIODIVERSITY OFFICER): No response.

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: Objects. On the basis of the information provided, CCW is unable to state that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on the Severn Estuary SPA. There are 2 major concerns: possible impacts on the bird features of the SPA from disturbance and the possibility of contamination entering the Severn Estuary leading in turn to potential adverse impacts on the birds and fish features of the SPA and Ramsar site. An appropriate assessment must be carried out by the Local Planning Authority. This must have regard to the manner in which it is proposed to be carried out or to any conditions or restrictions subject to which the Local Planning Authority propose that the consent, permission or other authorisation should be given that could avoid adverse impacts on the bird features of the SPA. Concerned that there is the potential for contaminated surface water directly or indirectly to enter the Severn Estuary and have an adverse impact on the sediments and/or invertebrates of the pSAC and Ramsar site. This could, in turn, have an adverse impact on the fish and birds of the Severn Estuary SPA, Ramsar and pSAC. Have the same concerns for the Severn Estuary SSSI. Also recommend that a condition be imposed to ensure any works between October and March ceased in the event of a wildfowl ban (imposed when birds become very stressed).

GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: No objection subject to a condition requiring the implementation of an appropriate programme of building recording and analysis. ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: No objection but recommend that the screening bund be kept at least 7m from the edge of the site to avoid the need for a Flood Defence Consent. Are satisfied that the mound will not have a significant impact on the quality of soils and groundwater given appropriate control under a Waste Management Licence Exemption. It is stated that there will be no water discharges from any of the construction operations direct to the Estuary. This should also include discharges to soil and groundwater during and post development. This can be dealt with as condition(s). Recommend conditions be attached to any permission on the site that include the submission of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site and that this be submitted and agreed prior to the commencement of development; no infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted; if, during development, contamination is found then no further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted an amendment to the Method Statement detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with; control of piling; development must be carried out in accordance with the Method Statement; upon completion of the remediation works a report must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority that provides verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the Method Statement; nothing other than uncontaminated material shall be used on site.

CALDICOT AND WENTLOOGE LEVELS DRAINAGE BOARD: No objection subject to specified conditions which include a 7m strip of land left clear of any building or obstruction along both banks of any watercourse; details of proposed surface water drainage to be submitted and agreed by the Board; no land drainage ditch to be filled or culverted without their consent; owners to be made aware of flood risks.

Relevant Planning History on Adjoining Sites:
08/0181 INSTALLATION OF A NATURAL GAS PIPELINE TO SERVE THE NEW SEVERN POWER STATION ROUTE OF PROPOSED MARSHFIELD TO USKMOUTH PIPELINE WEST NASH ROAD
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1 INTRODUCTION
1.1 This statement has been prepared by GVA Grimley Limited on behalf of Welsh Power Group Ltd to promote the land at Uskmouth Power Station, Uskmouth, Newport, as a candidate site for inclusion in the emerging Newport Local Development Plan (LDP).
1.2 The statement supplements the information provided in the duly completed Candidate Site Form above, and follows the main headlines contained in the questionnaire.

2 SITE DETAILS AND PROPOSED USES
2.1 The land extends to approximately 80 hectares and comprises the existing Uskmouth Power Station, where a new combined cycle gas turbine power generating facility is currently being built. The site also comprises a large area of land to the east, west and south of the power station area.
2.2 The eastern boundary of the site is formed by Julian’s Pill, as well as the water treatment works. To the south the site is bordered by the Gwent Levels and to the north and west the site meets with the banks of the River Usk.
2.3 As stated in previous submissions to the LDP, the power station and surrounding land could form the focus of a new energy park for Newport and, potentially, south east Wales. Such an initiative could see new development as well as the remediation of land, the installation of new energy generating equipment, waste and recycling facilities and other civic activities together with the improvement of access and infrastructure to existing or improved developments.
2.4 In light of the above we seek a mixed use and, if necessary or appropriate, ‘specialised’ or ‘civic’ employment allocation within the LDP, that could comprise the following uses:
   - Energy production;
   - Rail related business;
   - Waste recycling;
   - Waste to energy facilities;
   - General business and industry;
   - New roads and infrastructure; civic and institutional uses; and other mixed/commercial uses
2.5 The Power Station land could be developed in conjunction with other land in the Uskmouth Area, which could facilitate a range of ‘green’ employment uses as well as other more general business uses. These could be attracted to the area because of the readily available locally generated power supplies, the clear development potential of the area and existing rail links in the area. Such development is supported by current planning Policy. Indeed, Planning Policy Wales (PPW) states the following in terms of the green economy, business and social clusters and enterprises:
   ‘Local planning authorities should support the shift towards a green economy by encouraging the development of clusters of industrial and commercial uses deriving environmental benefit from co-location, especially through the development of waste stream technologies and practices (i.e. eco-industrial networks). Local planning authorities should also seek to support the development of innovative business and technology clusters. UDP policies need to identify potential networks and cluster areas, making clear the criteria used to categorise them, and the links to policies relating to the creation of the transport, environmental and telecommunications infrastructure needed to support such networks.’

3 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
3.1 The site comprises a mixture of previously developed land, and land within the curtilage of the existing Power Station and within the established urban boundary. The development of the site would therefore accord with the established principles of sustainable and brownfield development.
3.2 In terms of flood risk, the site lies to the east of the River Usk and is located within Zone C1 according to the TAN 15 Development Advice Maps. However, much of the east bank of the Usk has been subject to flood defence works and it is considered that the site is well served by flood defence infrastructure (a fact confirmed in the recent decision to approve a major new power station on the site). Any development in this area would be supported by a Flood Consequences Assessment as part of the planning application process.

3.3 The site is relatively flat in nature and does not have any known topographical or stability issues that would prevent its development. Furthermore, the site is not subject to any environmental protection designations and there are no known protected species at the site. The site is adjacent to the River Usk, which is a designated SSSI and SAC. However, development on the site is not expected to create any detrimental impact on the SSSI or SAC. Again, these matters will be confirmed as part of the planning application process and where appropriate remediation and mitigation can be included as part of the development process in order to improve the existing situation, thus leading to potential environmental improvements to the wider area.

3.4 The general area surrounding the site is industrial in nature with a range of heavy industrial land uses in the wider area. Further development in this area will therefore not be intrusive in the local landscape.

4.0 ACCESS
4.1 The site is currently accessed via West Nash Road. This road provides adequate access arrangements to the site and would be capable of being utilised for any further development at the site. However, other opportunities exist to improve the site’s connection with the wider highway network. Major new development within this area could create comprehensive infrastructure improvements that would alter the existing situation and provide enhanced infrastructure and highway provision.

4.2 This area also lies within close proximity of the proposed M4 relief road. Development of the M4 relief road would obviously have a major impact on this area, by opening up areas for future development and enhancing connection with the wider area. Whilst the site would undoubtedly benefit from the creation of the M4 relief road, major development of this area could be achieved irrespective of whether the M4 relief road is completed.

4.3 Public transport to the site is limited. Improvements could be made to the site’s connection with such infrastructure as part of any future development proposals and, again, this would be fully considered as part of the planning application process. However, the site itself is rail served which makes it relatively unique.

4.4 The development opportunities provided by the site are employment generating in nature and will therefore offer the opportunity for new jobs to the local community.

5.0 COMMUNITY ISSUES
5.1 As set out above, the site is relatively remote in terms of its connectivity with surrounding areas and communities. It is therefore not located in close proximity to schools or community facilities. Given the nature of the proposed development opportunity, this situation is considered to be a positive attribute of the site. This position is a strong and positive attribute of the site, especially when considered against the development proposals envisaged for the area.

5.2 Large scale employment uses such as those proposed at the site will provide important community benefits to the wider community in terms of job creation.

6.0 INFRASTRUCTURE AND CONTEXT
6.1 The site is already served by existing water, sewerage, electricity, gas and telecommunications services, which are vital to the running of the Power Station. As stated above, the site is rail served, which will be a major benefit to further employment uses in the area. Furthermore, the site is located a considerable distance away from residential properties, which is again seen a strong and positive attribute of the site that will enable it to accommodate large scale employment uses without conflict with surrounding uses.

7.0 LAND OWNERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES
7.1 We can confirm that the site is within the ownership of Welsh Power Group Ltd and that there are no known constraints or restrictions that would prevent its development over the LDP period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA Recommendation</td>
<td>The proportion of housing to open space should seek to ensure the retention of local character and ecological value. This is especially the case for site 1341.C1 which includes a cSINC designation- it is recommended that the cSINC is retained as open space, and a buffer is created between development and the cSINC, as well as between development and the SSSI to the north. PROWs, TPOs and protected hedgerows should be enhanced throughout the sites. The provision of housing should include a convenience store on at least one of the sites. It is recommended that walking and cycling routes to key services and facilities including employment are enhanced as part of development proposals. Enhanced bus provision should also be considered to reduce the potential effect of traffic growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Overall Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This site is separate to the settlement boundary of Langstone and is more rural in character. It is not felt appropriate to extend further ribbon development along the A48 in this location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.1 Site Name</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.2 Location</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Tregarn Road, Langstone, Newport NP197BU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.3 Grid Reference</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grid Reference</td>
<td>338993 190941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.4 Site Area</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>Approx. 0.13Ht.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation No</td>
<td>Date Lodged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

**Representation Text:** The contours across the site fall from the rear to the road.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

**Representation Text:** Car sales/pasture land

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

**Representation Text:** Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Commercial

**Council Response:** The site is greenfield

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Pasture land/orchard

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Representation Text:** The site would form part of an infill, which would have no undue affect on the landscape, as it would be only be visible from the road side of site.

**Council Response:** Countryside comments: No Strategic Landscape issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** No trees.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

**Representation Text:** The proposed development would blend with the existing buildings & have no change to existing conditions.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Tregarn Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: The site is greenfield

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
- Representation Text: No.
  - Council Response: Listed building n/a
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park n/a
  - conservation area n/a
  - Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
- Representation Text: Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development on Tregarn Road

**Council Response:**
- Yes. New access to meet visibility requirement

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
- Representation Text:
  - Close to greenfield areas.
- Council Response:
  - The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. Owing to the small size of the site off-site contributions for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
- Representation Text:
  - The site will be nearer to bus stops than existing residential homes.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
- Representation Text:
  - Within 200m
- Council Response:
  - 250 metres

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
- Representation Text:
  - Every 30 minutes.
- Council Response:
  - 30 min 1 hour service

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
- Representation Text:
  - 4 miles - Newport.
- Council Response:
  - Newport station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
- Representation Text:
  - 500m.
- Council Response:
  - Langstone garage shop 1.4km

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
- Representation Text:
  - Jobs accessed to business parks & M4 corridor to either West or East easy access to community services.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- Representation Text:
  - Both on & off road.
- Council Response:
  - On site provision

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
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### Question: 4.9 Open Space?
- **Representation Text:**
  - There are no PROW on the site
  - 394/1 runs adjacent to the site
- **Council Response:**
  - Shown on Drg. Ref 1.

### Question: 5.1 Schools?
- **Representation Text:**
  - Yes. Langstone Caerleon Caldicot
- **Council Response:**
  - Yes. Langstone Caerleon Caldicot

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:**
  - No.

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
- **Representation Text:**
  - The community would gain by removing a commercial garage from a residential area & complete houses to end of road.
- **Council Response:**
  - No.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
- **Representation Text:**
  - No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
- **Representation Text:**
  - All utilities are already available to the site.
- **Council Response:**
  - Yes. Sewerage network has recently been upgraded by Welsh Water, which would allow development in this area.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
- **Representation Text:**
  - No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
- **Representation Text:**
  - Yes. Sewerage network has recently been upgraded by Welsh Water, which would allow development in this area.
- **Council Response:**
  - Welsh Water Comments
  - Sewerage

  Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detrimental effect on the overall system. Welsh Water have recently upgraded the sewers in this area, which would allow for development in this area.
### Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

### Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

### Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representation Text:** The site is ideally suited to infill between the existing residential homes & the car sales garage.

**Council Response:** The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary

### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
| Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------|----------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2007.C1                             | 06/05/2009           | P        | P        | W       | M                 | Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Tregarn Road |

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**

No. The owner of pasture land - Mr Malcolm Trew 'The Brooklands', Langstone will form part of this application - his site marked in blue on plan.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**

Tregarn Garage owned by applicant. Pasture land by Mr Trew

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. Proposed boundary shown in blue on plan, which would devide off residential to pasture land.

**Council Response:**

The site is allocated as Countryside

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Council Response:**

RETENTION OF USE FOR USED CAR SALES 05/0699 25/11/2005 granted

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**

This proposal could quite easily be adopted into the next U.D.P as it will only need to extent the existing development boundaries to the end of Tregarn Road. This in turn would allow the existing commercial garage to be re-located to the more suitable commercial area of Newport.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Tregarn Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: 9 Map Included? Yes. Drg.Ref.1
### Site: 107/ Open Space adjacent to Ringland Circle

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
<td>SA Recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Council Response:** &nbsp;&n...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2041.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield?**

**Representation Text:**

The Ringland playing field has been used only for leisure

**Question: 3.10** Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 3.11** Agricultural Land?

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Question: 3.12** Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Representation Text:**

This is the last green area in Ringland for 9,000 residents. Under fields in trust we should protect our playing fields.

**Council Response:**

Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, public open space, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13** Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Council Response:**

TPO potential

**Question: 3.14** Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:**

.

**Question: 3.15** Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:**

.

**Question: 3.16** Archaeology?

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Council Response:**

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reas for not allocating in LDP.

**Question: 3.2** Greenfield?

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

**Question: 3.3** Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:**

No. No
### Question: 3.4  Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.5  Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.6  Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.7  SSSI?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Fields in trust policy is to dave playing fields under the Newport City Council Unity Development Plan.

### Question: 3.8  Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.9  Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

### Question: 4.1  Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:** No. The public highways are already over loaded from traffic and parking is limited. If this prospect is given the green light more green areas will have to be built on to supply the demand for parking. This will leave Ringland a concrete jungle.

### Question: 4.10  Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:** None

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Ringland Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.85Ha. 3.4Ha of the site proposed to be protected forms part of the informal play provision for the Ward. The Ringland Ward has a surplus of 7.76Ha of informal play provision.

### Question: 4.11  Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:** None

**Council Response:**

### Question: 4.2  Bus Route?

16/02/2012
Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
2041.C1 29/04/2009 P P W M Summary: Candidate Site for protection of Open Space adjacent to Ringland Circle

Representation Text: Two minutes

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
Representation Text: 4 times a hour

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
Representation Text: 5 miles

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
Representation Text: 400 hundred yards

Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
Representation Text: This will create no extra jobs in Ringland. Ringland has the highest unemployment rate in Newport

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
Representation Text: This green area would be less used by the residents of Ringland so it would discourage walking and cycling on our Ringland playing field.

Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
Representation Text: No. This is a playing field for the public to use as they wish.

Question: 4.9 Open Space?
Representation Text: 3 miles
Council Response: The open space within this area includes:
- Formal - Playing fields at Edward German Cres, Ringland Community Centre Playing Area
- Equipped - Community Centre, Playford Cres, Playing fields at Edward German Cres
- Informal - North of Nelson Drive & Ringland Circle, Cot Farm Close Circle, Goossens Close, Playford Cres, Land south of Sterndale Bennett rd and Land off Dunstable Road

Question: 5.1 Schools?
Representation Text: Yes. Four schools and a community centre.

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
Representation Text: The area kept as an playing field
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C1</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for protection of Open Space adjacent to Ringland Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Representation Text: Yes. The children will lose their playing field

**Council Response:**

N/A

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

Representation Text: Yes. 200 yards

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

Representation Text: Yes. Noise, from the development. Children will have to play on the streets which is a health and safety issue with the extra traffic.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Representation Text: No.

**Council Response:**

Welsh Water Comments

The green and open space allocations will have little or no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

Representation Text: None

**Council Response:**

The site is within the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

Representation Text: Extra traffic. Children will play on roads as playing area is taken away.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

Representation Text: Yes. Newport City Council owns the land but the residents of Ringland need this only green open space for health reasons.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

Representation Text: No. Health and safety for children

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

Representation Text: No.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C1</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for protection of Open Space adjacent to Ringland Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.4  Restrictive Covenants?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

*Representation Text: No. 1 to 3 years*

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

*Representation Text:*

- 9000 people live on the Ringland estate. Fields in Trust recommends a minimum standard for outdoor playing space of 2.4 hectares (6 acres) per 1000 people. Newport City Council has already broken this rule.

*Council Response:*

The site is currently designated as Environmental Space

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

*Representation Text: No.*

*Council Response:*

Relevant planning history on adjacent sites:
(i) 00/1328 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PREFABRICATED BUNGALOWS AND ERECTION OF 64 NO. NEW DETACHED AND SEMI-DETACHED BUNGALOWS IN PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENT GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS – 07/03/2001 NO CONSULTATION COMMENTS AVAILABLE ON SYSTEM
(ii) 00/1327 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PREFABRICATED BUNGALOWS, ERECTION OF NEW BUNGALOWS AND SETTING ASIDE OF LAND FOR FURTHER RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND FUTURE COMMUNITY FACILITIES (OUTLINE APPLICATION) GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS – 09/03/2001 NO CONSULTATION COMMENTS AVAILABLE ON SYSTEM

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

*Representation Text:*

- Newport City Council is building on all green areas inn Ringland (increasing bad health through lack of exercise).
- Ringland is over populated
- No youth clubs
- Swimming pool shut down (Hartridge swimming pool shut down by local Council)
- No bus route to International Sports Village (5 miles away) from Ringland
- Too many homes are being built in Ringland and is now overpopulated.
- No off street parking
- A higher percentage of Ringland residents report having a limiting long-term illness (26% compared to Newport 19%) or consider themselves as not in good health (Newport 12%

16/02/2012
I have enclosed the map of Ringland Estate where I think it's important that we try and save our remaining green spaces. The areas which I have marked out are the only suitable areas left for the residents of Ringland to be able to relax and have exercise, if we end up losing these areas it would not be good for the health and well being of the Ringland residents.

1. This area is well known for dog walking, residents walking and relaxing, picnics, and children playing ball games. The walk group (the ramblers) also use this route. This area is the only green space available to up to 8,000 Ringland residents on the Ringland Estate so should be protected.

2. Ringland shopping centre playing fields. There are two football pitches on this green area where the local football team (Spencer boys club) use for their matches in the football season. In the summer the local play group use the area for outdoor activities. There is very little green space left, on football match days, so the local residents find it hard to find an area to be able to exercise and relax.

3. There is a small area of green land on the top of Ringland estate next of Edward German Crescent and Ringland wood. This small area of green open space in used by the residents who live on the top of the estate as it is the only green space close to them as they live on top of a very steep hill. This area is used by all ages and groups for all activities.

4. The marked blue space is a small area of land is where the old Spencer youth club use to be for the previous 35 years, before was burnt down about five years ago, this area of land is owned by the leisure services of NEWPORT CITY COUNCIL who should not be allowed to sell or develop this area unless it is for sport and leisure. The Spencer boys club also used to run their football team from this site bit have been promised a new home elsewhere, but for the youth of Ringland who don't like football they have no facilities for other sports. This area is owned by leisure services of NCC so it should only be used for leisure not for NCC to make money.

A higher percentage of Ringland residents report having a limiting long term illness (28.4% compared to Newport wide 21.6%) or consider themselves as not in good health (Newport 12% Ringland 16.46%). The above statistics are indicative of the high levels of deprivation identified within Ringland and are the main indices used when selecting the ward as a priority for delivering of the Community First Programme. I have lived in Ringland all my life and it is sad to see all our leisure facilities and our green open space disappear, under the new Local Development Plan for Newport I hope you take our feelings on board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for protection of Leisure areas on land adjacent to Cot Farm Circle

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

- **Representation Text:** Ringland Shopping Centre Playing Fields

### Question: 2.2 Location

- **Representation Text:** Ringland Circle

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

- **Representation Text:** 335514 188347

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

- **Representation Text:** About 4 acres

- **Council Response:** 13.25

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

- **Representation Text:** Playing fields

### Question: 2.6 Current Use

- **Representation Text:** Leisure for children, dog walking, childrens park, football pitch.

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

- **Representation Text:** Protection of Open Space. (Clarification email received 1.12.11)

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

- **Representation Text:** No. The Ringland playing field has been used only for leisure

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

- **Representation Text:** This is the last green area in Ringland for 9,000 residents. Under fields in trust we should protect our playing fields.

- **Council Response:** Countryside comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Poly</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C2</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for protection of Leisure areas on land adjacent to Cot Farm Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- Representation Text: Council owned woodland and trees with TPO potential.
- Council Response: No.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- Representation Text: 
- Council Response: 

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- Representation Text: 
- Council Response: 

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- Representation Text: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP
- Council Response: 

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- Representation Text: Yes.
- Council Response: 

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: 

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: 

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: 

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: 

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- Representation Text: Yes. Fields in trust policy is to dave playing fields under the Newport City Council Unity Development Plan.
- Council Response: There is a SINc on the site - Ringland Woods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for protection of Leisure areas on land adjacent to Cot Farm Circle

**Question:** 3.8 Protected Species?

Representation Text: No.

**Council Response:**

- **Question:** 4.1 Access to Highway?
  - Representation Text: No. The public highways are already over loaded from traffic and parking is limited. If this prospect is given the green light more green areas will have to be built on to supply the demand for parking. This will leave Ringland a concrete jungle.

- **Question:** 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
  - Representation Text: None

**Council Response:**

- **Question:** 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
  - Representation Text: None

- **Question:** 4.2 Bus Route?
  - Representation Text: Two minutes

- **Question:** 4.3 Bus Frequency?
  - Representation Text: 4 times a hour

- **Question:** 4.4 Railway Station?
  - Representation Text: 5 miles

- **Question:** 4.5 Convenience Shop?
  - Representation Text: 400 hundred yards

- **Question:** 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

**Representation Text:** This green area would be less used by the residents of Ringland so it would discourage walking and cycling on our Ringland playing field.

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:** No. This is a playing field for the public to use as they wish.

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?

**Representation Text:** 3 miles

**Council Response:** The open space within this area includes:
- Formal - Playing fields at Edward German Cres, Ringland Community Centre Playing Area
- Equipped - Community Centre, Playford Cres, Playing fields at Edward German Cres
- Informal - North of Nelson Drive & Ringland Circle, Cot Farm Close Circle, Goossens Close, Playford Cres, Land south of Sterndale Bennett rd and Land off Dunstable Road

### Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Four schools and a community centre.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:** No. No

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:** The area kept as an playing field

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:** Yes. The children will lose their playing field

**Council Response:** N/A

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:** 200 yards

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Noise, from the development. Children will have to play on the streets which is a health and safety issue with the extra traffic.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C2</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:** No.  

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments  

The green and open space allocations will have little or no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan.

**Question: 6.4** Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?  

**Representation Text:** No.  

**Question: 6.5** Logical Extension?  

**Representation Text:** None  

**Council Response:** The site is within the settlement boundary.

**Question: 6.6** Precedent Setting?  

**Representation Text:** Extra traffic. Children will play on roads as playing area is taken away.

**Question: 7.1** Site Owned by Proposer?  

**Representation Text:** Yes. Newport City Council owns the land but the residents of Ringland need this only green open space for health reasons.

**Question: 7.2** Site Owner?  

**Representation Text:** No. Health and safety for children

**Question: 7.3** Interest in Adjoining Land?  

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4** Restrictive Covenants?  

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5** Realistic Timescale?  

**Representation Text:** No. 1 to 3 years

**Question: 7.6** Development Boundary Change?  

**Representation Text:** 9000 people live on the Ringland estate. Fields in Trust recommends a minimum standard for outdoor playing space of 2.4 hectares (6 acres) per 1000 people. Newport City Council has already broken this rule.

**Council Response:** The site is currently allocated as Environmental Space.

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for protection of Leisure areas on land adjacent to Cot Farm Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

Representation Text: Newport City Council is building on all green areas in Ringland (increasing bad health through lack of exercise).

- Ringland is over populated
- No youth clubs
- Swimming pool shut down (Hartridge swimming pool shut down by local Council)
- No bus route to International Sports Village (5 miles away) from Ringland
- Too many homes are being built in Ringland and is now overpopulated.
- No off street parking
- A higher percentage of Ringland residents report having a limiting long-term illness (26% compared to Newport 19%) or consider themselves as not in good health (Newport 12% Ringland 15.6%)

I have enclosed the map of Ringland Estate where I think it’s important that we try and save our remaining green spaces. The areas which I have marked out are the only suitable areas left for the residents of Ringland to be able to relax and have exercise, if we end up losing these areas it would not be good for the health and well being of the Ringland residents.

1. This area is well known for dog walking, residents walking and relaxing, picnics, and children playing ball games. The walk group (the ramblers) also use this route. This area is the only green space available to up to 8,000 Ringland residents on the Ringland Estate so should be protected.
2. Ringland shopping centre playing fields. There are two football pitches on this green area where the local football team (Spencer boys club) use for their matches in the football season. In the summer the local play group use the area for outdoor activities. There is very little green space left, on football match days, so the local residents find it hard to find an area to be able to exercise and relax.
3. There is a small area of green land on the top of Ringland estate next to Edward German Crescent and Ringland wood. This small area of green open space in used by the residents who live on the top of the estate as it is the only green space close to them as they live on top of a very steep hill. This area is used by all ages and groups for all activities.
4. The marked blue space is a small area of land is where the old Spencer youth club use to be for the previous 35 years, before was burnt down about five years ago, this area of land is owned by the leisure services of NEWPORT CITY COUNCIL who should not be allowed to sell or develop this area unless it is for sport and leisure. The Spencer boys club also used to run their football team from this site bit have been promised a new home elsewhere, but for the youth of Ringland who don't like football they have no facilities for other sports. This area is owned by leisure services of NCC so it should only be used for leisure not for NCC to make money.

A higher percentage of Ringland residents report having a limiting long-term illness (28.4% compared to Newport wide 21.6%) or consider themselves as not in good health (Newport 12% Ringland 16.46%).

The above statistics are indicative of the high levels of deprivation identified within Ringland and are the main indices used when selecting the ward as a priority for delivering of the Community First Programme.

I have lived in Ringland all my life and it is sad to see all out leisure facilities and our green open space disappear, under the new Local Development Plan for Newport I hope you take our feelings on board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for protection of Leisure areas on land adjacent to Cot Farm Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 9</td>
<td>Map Included?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for protection of open space adjacent Edward German Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.1</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Open space adjacent Edward German Crescent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.2</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ringland Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.3</td>
<td>Grid Reference</td>
<td>335576 188729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.4</td>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>About 4 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.5</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>Playing fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.6</td>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Leisure for children, dog walking, childrens park, football pitch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 2.7</td>
<td>Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: 108/ Open Space adjacent Edward German Crescent

Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C3</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protection of Open Space. (Clarification email received 1.12.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

- **Representation Text:** No. The Ringland playing field has been used only for leisure.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representation Text:** This is the last green area in Ringland for 9,000 residents. Under fields in trust we should protect our playing fields.

- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

- **Council Response:** Council owned woodland and trees with TPO potential.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

- **Representation Text:**

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

- **Representation Text:**

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** No. No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C3</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.4** Flood Risk?

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 3.5** Adjacent to Water Course?

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 3.6** Topography / Stability Problems?

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?

*Representation Text: Yes.* Fields in trust policy is to dave playing fields under the Newport City Council Unity Development Plan.

*Council Response: The site has a SINC within its boundary - Ringland Wood*

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?

*Representation Text: No.*

*Council Response: Listed building n/a Ancient monuments n/a historic park n/a conservation area n/a Within Newport boundary*

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?

*Representation Text: No.* The public highways are already over loaded from traffic and parking is limited. If this prospect is given the green light more green areas will have to be built on to supply the demand for parking. This will leave Ringland a concrete jungle.

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?

*Representation Text: None* The proposed development falls within the Ringland Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.85Ha. The Ward has a shortfall of formal play space of 8.15Ha and this site contributes 3.3Ha of formal play space as part of the play audit.

**Question: 4.11** Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

*Representation Text: None*
| Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodged Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------------------------------|
| 2041.C3                                | 29/04/2009         | P       | P        | W        | M                | Summary: Candidate Site for protection of open space adjacent Edward German Crescent |

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
- **Representation Text:** Two minutes

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
- **Representation Text:** 4 times a hour

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Representation Text:** 5 miles

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** 400 hundred yards

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** This will create no extra jobs in Ringland. Ringland has the highest unemployment rate in Newport

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** This green area would be less used by the residents of Ringland so it would discourage walking and cycling on our Ringland playing field.

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** No. This is a playing field for the public to use as they wish.

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?
- **Representation Text:** 3 miles
  - **Council Response:** The open space within this area includes:
    - Formal - Playing fields at Edward German Cres, Ringland Community Centre Playing Area
    - Equipped - Community Centre, Playford Cres, Playing fields at Edward German Cres
    - Informal - North of Nelson Drive & Ringland Circle, Cot Farm Close Circle, Goossens Close, Playford Cres, Land south of Sterndale Bennett rd and Land off Dunstable Road

### Question: 5.1 Schools?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Four schools and a community centre.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:** No. No

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C3</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for protection of open space adjacent Edward German Crescent

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- Representation Text: Yes. The children will lose their playing field
- Council Response: N/A

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
- Representation Text: Yes. 200 yards
- Council Response: N/A

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
- Representation Text: Yes. Noise, from the development. Children will have to play on the streets which is a health and safety issue with the extra traffic.
- Council Response: N/A

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: Welsh Water Comments
  - The green and open space allocations will have little or no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**
- Representation Text: No.
- Council Response: N/A

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**
- Representation Text: None
- Council Response: The site is within the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
- Representation Text: Extra traffic. Children will play on roads as playing area is taken away.
- Council Response: N/A

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- Representation Text: Yes. Newport City Council owns the land but the residents of Ringland need this only green open space for health reasons.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- Representation Text: No. Health and safety for children

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.4</th>
<th>Restrictive Covenants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.5</th>
<th>Realistic Timescale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No. 1 to 3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.6</th>
<th>Development Boundary Change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>9000 people live on the Ringland estate. Fields in Trust recommends a minimum standard for outdoor playing space of 2.4 hectares (6 acres) per 1000 people. Newport City Council has already broken this rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The site is currently allocated as environmental space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.7</th>
<th>Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.8</th>
<th>Planning Application Refusals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.9</th>
<th>Planning Applications Pending?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 8</th>
<th>Other Information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>- Newport City Council is building on all green areas inn Ringland (increasing bad health through lack of exercise).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ringland is over populated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No youth clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Swimming pool shut down (Hartridge swimming pool shut down by local Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No bus route to International Sports Village (5 miles away) from Ringland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Too many homes are being built in Ringland and is now overpopulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No off street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A higher percentage of Ringland residents report having a limiting long-term illness (26% compared to Newport 19%) or consider themselves as not in good health (Newport 12% Ringland 15.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Letter Received on 29.05.2009

I have enclosed the map of Ringland Estate where I think it's important that we try and save our remaining green spaces. The areas which I have marked out are the only suitable areas left for the residents of Ringland to be able to relax and have exercise, if we end up losing these areas it would not be good for the health and well being of the Ringland residents. 1. This area is well known for dog walking, residents walking and relaxing, picnics, and children playing ball games. The walk group (the ramblers) also use this route. This area is the only green space available to up to 8,000 Ringland residents on the Ringland Estate so should be protected.
2. Ringland shopping centre playing fields. There are two football pitches on this green area where the local football team (Spencer boys club) use for their matches in the football season. In the summer the local play group use the area for outdoor activities. There is very little green space left, on football match days, so the local residents find it hard to find an area to be able to exercise and relax.

3. There is a small area of green land on the top of Ringland estate next ot Edward German Crescent and Ringland wood. This small area of green open space is used by the residents who live on the top of the estate as it is the only green space close to them as they live on top of a very steep hill. This area is used by all ages and groups for all activities.

4. The marked blue space is a small area of land is where the old Spencer youth club use to be for the previous 35 years, before was burnt down about five years ago, this area of land is owned by the leisure services of NEWPORT CITY COUNCIL who should not be allowed to sell or develop this area unless it is for sport and leisure. The Spencer boys club also used to run their football team from this site but have been promised a new home elsewhere, but for the youth of Ringland who don't like football they have no facilities for other sports. This area is owned by leisure services of NCC so it should only be used for leisure not for NCC to make money.

A higher percentage of Ringland residents report having a limiting long-term illness (28.4% compared to Newport wide 21.6%) or consider themselves as not in good health (Newport 12% Ringland 16.4%). The above statistics are indicative of the high levels of deprivation identified within Ringland and are the main indices used when selecting the ward as a priority for delivering of the Community First Programme.

I have lived in Ringland all my life and it is sad to see all out leisure facilities and our green open space disappear, under the new Local Development Plan for Newport I hope you take our feelings on board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C3</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for protection of open space adjacent Edward German Crescent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Map Included?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C4</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site: 109/ Old Spencer Youth Club adjacent Ringland Circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Old Spencer Youth Club adjacent Ringland Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ringland Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grid Reference</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: No allocation proposed for this developed site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C4</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 2.4 Site Area
- **Representation Text:** About 4 acres
- **Council Response:** 0.24ha

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description
- **Representation Text:** Playing fields

### Question: 2.6 Current Use
- **Representation Text:** Leisure for children, dog walking, childrens park, football pitch.

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
- **Representation Text:** Protection of Open Space. (Clarification email received 1.12.11)

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
- **Representation Text:** The Ringland playing field has been used only for leisure
- **Council Response:** The site is brownfield

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
- **Representation Text:** This is the last green area in Ringland for 9,000 residents. Under fields in trust we should protect our playing fields.
- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Possible TPO potential.

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C4</td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for protection of Old Spencer Youth Club adjacent Ringland Circle

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

Representation Text: 

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

Representation Text: 

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

Representation Text: Yes.

Council Response: The site is brownfield

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

Representation Text: Yes. Fields in trust policy is to dave playing fields under the Newport City Council Unity Development Plan.

Council Response: the site is not affected by SSSI, SINC, etc

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Listed building n/a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate Site for protection of Old Spencer Youth Club adjacent Ringland Circle

---

**Ancient monuments n/a**

**historic park n/a**

**conservation area n/a**

Within Newport boundary

---

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**

No. The public highways are already overloaded from traffic and parking is limited. If this prospect is given the green light more green areas will have to be built on to supply the demand for parking. This will leave Ringland a concrete jungle.

---

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Council Response:**

The proposed development falls within the Ringland Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.85Ha. The site being proposed for protection does not form any part of the play space audit. Its location close to the highway and existing equipped and formal play space would mean that it would only be categorised and used as informal play space. The Ringland Ward has a surplus of 7.76Ha of informal play provision.

---

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

None

---

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**

Two minutes

---

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**

4 times a hour

---

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**

5 miles

---

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**

400 hundred yards

---

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**

This will create no extra jobs in Ringland. Ringland has the highest unemployment rate in Newport

---

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**

This green area would be less used by the residents of Ringland so it would discourage walking and cycling on our Ringland playing field.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

Representation Text: No. This is a playing field for the public to use as they wish.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

Representation Text: 3 miles

Council Response: The open space within this area includes:

- Formal - Playing fields at Edward German Cres, Ringland Community Centre Playing Area
- Equipped - Community Centre, Playford Cres, Playing fields at Edward German Cres
- Informal - North of Nelson Drive & Ringland Cricle, Cot Farm Close Circle, Goossens Close, Playford Cres, Land south of Sterndale Bennett rd and Land off Dunstable Road

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

Representation Text: Yes. Four schools and a community centre.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

Representation Text: No. No

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

Representation Text: The area kept as a playing field

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Representation Text: Yes. The children will lose their playing field

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

Representation Text: 200 yards

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

Representation Text: Yes. Noise, from the development. Children will have to play on the streets which is a health and safety issue with the extra traffic.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments. The green and open space allocations will have little or no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/04/2009</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for protection of Old Spencer Youth Club adjacent Ringland Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**
- Representation Text: None

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
- Representation Text: Extra traffic. Children will play on roads as playing area is taken away.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- Representation Text: Yes. Newport City Council owns the land but the residents of Ringland need this only green open space for health reasons.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- Representation Text: No. Health and safety for children

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- Representation Text: No. 1 to 3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- Representation Text: 9000 people live on the Ringland estate. Fields in Trust recommends a minimum standard for outdoor playing space of 2.4 hectares (6 acres) per 1000 people. Newport City Council has already broken this rule.
  - Council Response: The site is currently white land within the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- Representation Text: No.
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

- Newport City Council is building on all green areas in Ringland (increasing bad health through lack of exercise).
- Ringland is over populated
- No youth clubs
- Swimming pool shut down (Bartridge swimming pool shut down by local Council)
- No bus route to International Sports Village (5 miles away) from Ringland
- Too many homes are being built in Ringland and is now overpopulated.
- No off street parking
- A higher percentage of Ringland residents report having a limiting long-term illness (26% compared to Newport 19%) or consider themselves as not in good health (Newport 12% Ringland 15.6%)

Letter Received on 29.05.2009

I have enclosed the map of Ringland Estate where I think it's important that we try and save our remaining green spaces. The areas which I have marked out are the only suitable areas left for the residents of Ringland to be able to relax and have exercise, if we end up losing these areas it would not be good for the health and well being of the Ringland residents.

1. This area is well known for dog walking, residents walking and relaxing, picnics, and children playing ball games. The walk group (the ramblers) also use this route. This area is the only green space available to up to 8,000 Ringland residents on the Ringland Estate so should be protected.

2. Ringland shopping centre playing fields. There are two football pitches on this green area where the local football team (Spencer boys club) use for their matches in the football season. In the summer the local play group use the area for outdoor activities. There is very little green space left, on football match days, so the local residents find it hard to find an area to be able to exercise and relax.

3. There is a small area of green land on the top of Ringland estate next of Edward German Crescent and Ringland wood. This small area of green open space in used by the residents who live on the top of the estate as it is the only green space close to them as they live on top of a very steep hill. This area is used by all ages and groups for all activities.

4. The marked blue space is a small area of land is where the old Spencer youth club use to be for the previous 35 years, before was burnt down about five years ago, this area of land is owned by the leisure services of NEWPORT CITY COUNCIL who should not be allowed to sell or develop this area unless it is for sport and leisure. The Spencer boys club also used to run their football team from this site bit have been promised a new home elsewhere, but for the youth of Ringland who don't like football they have no facilities for other sports. This area is owned by leisure services of NCC so it should only be used for leisure not for NCC to make money.

A higher percentage of Ringland residents report having a limiting long-term illness (28.4% compared to Newport wide 21.6%) or consider themselves as not in good health (Newport 12% Ringland 16.46%).

The above statistics are indicative of the high levels of deprivation identified within Ringland and are the main indices used when selecting the ward as a priority for delivering of the Community First Programme.

I have lived in Ringland all my life and it is sad to see all out leisure facilities and our green open space disappear, under the new Local Development Plan for Newport I hope you take our feelings on board.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

Map Included?

Yes.
Candidate site for open retail use on 28 East Retail Park

Question: SA Recommendation
Council Response:
Next to SINC- any potentially negative effects on habitats or species should be investigated and mitigated prior to development on site. Further development of the site should seek to enhance green space throughout, to connect to the nearby SINC as well as the wider biodiversity value of the plan area.
The site is in Pillgwenlly ward, which suffers from high levels of deprivation. As such, it is recommended that alongside the provision of retail, the site offers a wider range of community and local facilities to promote an increase in equality. As suggested in the submission, non-car accessibility should be enhanced through any development on site.

Question: Overall Council Response
Council Response:
Planning Policy Wales is clear in promoting a city centre first approach to the consideration of retail proposals. Furthermore, there is no identified need for additional retail floorspace in Newport outside of the city centre (Collier International Retail Study, July 2010). It is recommended that the Candidate Site is not allocated for open retail development in the Local Development.

Question: 2.1 Site Name
Representation Text: 28 East Retail Park

Question: 2.2 Location
Representation Text: Docks Way, Maesglas, Newport, NP20 2NN

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
Representation Text: 330759 185994

Question: 2.4 Site Area
Representation Text: 7.29ha

Question: 2.5 Brief Description
Representation Text: The site is already developed. It consists of 8No. Restricted Class A1 retail units and an A3 unit set around a central car park fronting onto and accessed via Docks Way to the north. The site is bound by Usk Way to the South.
In total, the site provides approximately 19,990 sqm of restricted Class A1 floor space within 9No. units of varying sizes up to 6,200sqm.

Question: 2.6 Current Use
### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Proposed Use(s):**
- Under the initial planning permission (App No: 00/0760) the uses of the units are restricted to the sale of DIY products, vehicle goods and accessories, furniture, carpets and floor coverings, electrical household goods and household furnishings.
- Unit 1 was also allowed to also include a garden centre, an ancillary café and limited amounts of clothing, confectionary, beauty products, stationary, toys and entertainment goods.
- Unit 7 can also be used for Health and Fitness uses (Class D2) at ground floor and for the sale of sportswear on the first floor, following the variation of a condition on the original consent (App No: 03/1340)
- This is also the case for Unit 6, as the range of goods from this unit has been widened to include office equipment.

**Countryside comments:**
No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

**Brownfield?**
- Yes. Existing retail park.

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?

**Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- No.

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?

**Agricultural Land?**
- No.

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

**Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- The surrounding area is mixed in terms of use and landscape quality. To the north, on the opposite side of Docks Way, is a run down area of poor quality employment buildings and retail warehouses.
- To the south, beyond Usk Way, lie the docks, related employment buildings and the Docks Way Waste Disposal Site.
- To the west, beyond the railway line, lies a medium density suburban residential area.
- The proposed use of the site for unrestricted A1 retail uses would not alter the physical nature of the site and as such the impact on the local landscape would be unaltered.

**Council Response:**
Countryside comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Trees and Hedgerows?**
- Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2046.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for open retail use on 28 East Retail Park

**Council Response:**

- **Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
  - Possible TPO potential.
  - The existing landscape including trees and a grassland around the edge of the site will be retained and enhanced (if required).

- **Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
  - No.

- **Archaeology?**
  - No.
  - Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

- **Greenfield?**
  - No.

- **Contaminated Land Risk?**
  - No.

- **Flood Risk?**
  - No.

- **Adjacent to Water Course?**
  - No.

- **Topography / Stability Problems?**
  - No.

- **SSSI?**
  - No.

- **Protected Species?**
  - No.

- **Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
  - No.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2046.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for open retail use on 28 East Retail Park

Council Response:
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
- Representation Text: Yes.
- Council Response: Yes, existing retail park transport statement may be required

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
- Representation Text: Existing situation unchanged.
- Council Response: The proposed development falls within the Pillgwenlly Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 2.19Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
- Representation Text: The site is already well served by a frequent bus link and increased use of the site could improve patronage.

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
- Representation Text: Adjacent to the site on Docks Way. Bus Route 35 stops outside the site and connects to Newport Bus Station in the City Centre and Duffryn.
- Council Response: Docks Way- adjacent to site.

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
- Representation Text: The bus stops outside the site each way every 7 to 8 minute throughout the day.
- Council Response: 10-20 mins

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- Representation Text: Just under 2 miles
- Council Response: Newport 2.9km

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- Representation Text: 0.4 miles to Lidl on Docks Way
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2046.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>2046.C1</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

*Representation Text:*

- Very accessible. The site is well placed to provide retail opportunities to serve the sizeable population of workers and residents which are within walking distance of the site.

**Council Response:**

- The site is well located to serve a large catchment area on foot or by bicycle. Access arrangements and cycle storage facilities are already in place and can by further enhanced if necessary to improve non-car accessibility further.

**Council Response:**

- Good links to existing infrastructure - cycleways + flyways.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

*Representation Text:*

- The site is well located to serve a large catchment area on foot or by bicycle. Access arrangements and cycle storage facilities are already in place and can by further enhanced if necessary to improve non-car accessibility further.

**Council Response:**

- Public footpath access will not be altered.

**Council Response:**

- No PROW listed for this site.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

*Representation Text:*

- Public footpath access will not be altered.

**Council Response:**

- No PROW listed for this site.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

*Representation Text:*

- Formal open space is located at YMCA Sports Ground and Measglas Playing Fields

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

*Representation Text:*

- Yes. Maeglas Primary and Nursery School is 0.4 miles from the site.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

*Representation Text:*

- No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

*Representation Text:*

- Local workers and residents would benefit from the widening of uses at the site by way of improved local retail facilities, reducing their need to travel to meet their everyday requirements and strengthening of the local economy.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

*Representation Text:*

- No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

*Representation Text:*

- The site is already fully connected to services.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
Infrastructure Capacity?

Yes.

Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development do that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements beign undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning departament via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2046.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for open retail use on 28 East Retail Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**
- The nearest residential property is 0.3 miles west of the site.

**Council Response:**
- The site is located within the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**
- 28 East Retail Park is an existing Retail Park located at an important gateway location. Due to the current economic climate, the site is currently suffering from higher levels of vacancy, which is not assisted by the inappropriate retail sales restriction.

- It is our client’s view that the site is ideally located to meet convenience and wider retail needs and could function well as a local centre.

- Increased usage and occupancy of this existing site would improve the perception of the area – vital in this economic climate – and generally improve the vitality and vibrancy of the surrounding area.

**Council Response:**
- The site is located within the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**
- The open A1 use of the site will enable a wider range of shops and facilities to be located at the Retail Park, which could help support potential residential or mixed use development at Whitehead Works and Monmouthshire Bank Sidings.

- The widening of goods that could be sold from Park could lead to new job creation – as the site becomes more attractive to a range of occupiers. Our client’s proposal could therefore become a source of jobs for nearby (proposed) residential development

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**
- No. Agent for site owner.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**
- No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. There was a covenant set out in the Section 106 Agreement secured for planning application (App No: 03/1307) relating to Unit 7. This covenant identifies Units 2 and 6 as ‘restricted units’ where no mezzanine flooring can be installed unless agreed in writing with the Council.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. The site is developed and open retail use could commence immediately.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. No change to the development boundary is required. However, the land is currently not subject to any allocation in the adopted Local Plan. Therefore, the site should be allocated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2046.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for open retail use on 28 East Retail Park

---

**Council Response:**
The site is allocated as white land within the settlement boundary

---

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Council Response:**
DEVELOPMENT OF 6/7 RETAIL UNITS
00/0760 19/09/2001 19/09/2001
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: No objection subject to a dedicated right turn lane incorporating pedestrian refuge islands suitable for cyclists being provided.

DEVELOPMENT OF 2 RETAIL UNITS
00/0761 19/09/2001 Granted

EXTENSION AND CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING RETAIL UNIT TO PROVIDE HEALTH AND FITNESS (USE CLASS D2) AT GROUND FLOOR AND RETAIL USE (CLASS A1) FOR SALE OF SPORTS CLOTHING AND EQUIPMENT AT FIRST FLOOR
03/1340 15/11/2004 granted

DEVELOPMENT OF RETAIL PARK & GARDEN CENTRE INCORPORATING CAR PARKING SERVICING & ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS
93/0294 23/05/1995 Granted
In basement

Relevant history on adjacent sites:
DEVELOPMENT OF DUAL CARRIAGEWAY DISTRIBUTOR ROAD BETWEEN PONT EBBW AND COLDRA ROUNDBOUTS - 99/0694

---

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:**
No. Advertisement application (App No: 04/1424) at Unit 8 (Comet), for display of internally illuminated shop fascia sign, refused 26/11/2004

---

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:**
No. Current advertisement application (App No. 09/0219) removal and replacement of existing sign and installation of 2. No additional totem signs.

---

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**
The principle of retail use on the site has been established since 2001. To date, the Park has been limited to traditional retail warehouse units. However, the site is considered suitable and appropriate for wider retail uses given its location and the benefits that an open A1 consent could bring to the area.

We therefore request that the site is allocated in the Local Development Plan for retail purposes and identified in the Council’s retail policies as open A1 retail space and, potentially, a district centre.

In considering the potential for a retail allocation of the retail park, the following points should be given due consideration.

- The site is appropriately located within the urban boundary, and well connected to the city centre;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2046.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is close to a large population of potential consumers including existing residents and workers and land earmarked for major residential development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The proximity of the site to these users will reduce the reliance on the car travel thereby meeting accessibility and sustainability requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvements in patronage to the site would support public transport services serving the site and locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The current retail restriction has – in part - resulted in underused facilities with the Park currently suffering from a high level of vacancies. This has implications for the vitality and vibrancy of the locality, as well as the perception of this part of Newport. The Park is at an important gateway location and its viability should be given due consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>• By designating the site for open A1 consent, the Park would become more attractive to potential occupiers thereby providing a boost to the economy through the creation of new job opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Given the current proposals for the city centre, and the identified levels of demand for both convenience and comparison goods, it is considered that the lifting of the retail restrictions on this site would not impact on the vitality and viability of the city centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** 9  
**Map Included?** Yes.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2049</th>
<th>Davies MBE, Mr Robert</th>
<th>Agent: RPS Group PLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2049.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land south of Meadowlands Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 111/ Meadowlands Close

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

**Question:** Detailed Representation Texts

**Council Response:**

1. The proportion of housing to open space should seek to ensure the retention of local character and ecological value. This is especially the case for site 1341.C1 which includes a cSINC designation- it is recommended that the cSINC is retained as open space, and a buffer is created between development and the cSINC, as well as between development and the SSSI to the north.
2. PROWs, TPOs and protected hedgerows should be enhanced throughout the sites.
3. The provision of housing should include a convenience store on at least one of the sites.
4. It is recommended that walking and cycling routes to key services and facilities including employment are enhanced as part of development proposals. Enhanced bus provision should also be considered to reduce the potential effect of traffic growth.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

The site is located outside the settlement boundary of Parc Seymour and part of the site is allocated as a SINC.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question:** 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land south of Meadowlands Close

**Question:** 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Parc Seymour, Langstone, Newport

**Question:** 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST4091SE

**Council Response:** 340483 191486
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2049.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land south of Meadowlands Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

- **Representation Text:** 0.98 ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

- **Representation Text:** Sits in a bowl with land to south gently rising to A48. Site itself is predominantly flat.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

- **Representation Text:** Field

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

- **Representation Text:** Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

- **Representation Text:** No. Greenfield site abutting residential development to the north and recreation ground to east

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representation Text:** Believed to be last used for stabling of ponies, believed to be Grade III

  **Council Response:** Welsh Government comment: High Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. There is a high probability of BMV at this site. Grade 3a from previous (post revision) survey (035/96 Green Meadow Farm).

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representation Text:** Surrounding landscape is pleasant but the site lies at a low level, is not prominent and has residential development to the north with play area and recreation ground to the east.

  **Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Part of proposed SLA 6 Wentwood. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**


  **Council Response:** No TPOs at site.

  **Potential TPOs**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2049.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land south of Meadowlands Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

**Representation Text:** Existing mature trees and hedgerows could be maintained and additional landscaping features incorporated.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:** Village is well served for green space and open space could be incorporated into any residential development, thereby enhancing provision.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In part of a medieval hunting park. Southern part close to line of Roman road. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:** No. Site sits discreetly in the landscape. No stability problems.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Countryside designation in adopted UDP

**Council Response:** No SINC, SSSI etc on site

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** Not known

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2049.C1</td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land south of Meadowlands Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Vehicular access is available from the hammerhead at Meadowlands Close, and there are footpath links along the northern boundary and to the west of the site. Traffic from development could be accommodated.

**Council Response:**

- Yes
- Yes

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:** Provision for open space can be made within the development or development could make financial contribution to open space improvements.

**Council Response:**

- The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. Owing to the small size of the development an off-site contributions for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

**Question: 4.11** Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?

**Representation Text:** Has reasonable links to bus services.

**Question: 4.2** Bus Route?

**Representation Text:** Approx 180m to Greenmeadow Drive with additional bus stops on A48 which could be accessed via footpaths.

**Council Response:**

- 300 metres

**Question: 4.3** Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:** Hourly bus service to Chepstow and Newport.

**Council Response:**

- 30 min -1hour service

**Question: 4.4** Railway Station?

**Representation Text:** Mainline at Newport (approx 7 miles)

**Council Response:**

- newport station

**Question: 4.5** Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:** Penhow Community Shop (500m) includes Home Delivery. Spar at garage in Langstone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Walking and Cycling?</td>
<td>Close to footpaths. A48 well served with paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Public Rights of Way?</td>
<td>As shown on the accompanying plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Open Space?</td>
<td>Recreation area with football pitch and play area within approx 60m. Formal and Equipped space at Rockfield Playground, Parc Seymour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Schools?</td>
<td>Not within Parc Seymour. Junior School at Langstone. Secondary Schools Newport or Chepstow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Community Engagement?</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Community Aspirations?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?</td>
<td>Believed main services etc available from village. To be investigated further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?</td>
<td>Residential development to north. Recreation ground to east. Countryside to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049.C1</td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Sewerage**

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water Supply**

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

**Nash Waste Water Treatment Works**

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

No.

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2049.C1</td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development on land south of Meadowlands Close

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

*Representation Text:* The site related to the existing village and is discreet in the landscape.

*Council Response:* The site is adjacent to the village boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

*Representation Text:* It is a logical extension to the village. Other sites do not have the same characteristics.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

*Representation Text:* No. Owners are aware of the submission.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

*Representation Text:* No. Option holder.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Subject to planning permission possibly within 3 years.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Village settlement boundary would need to be amended.

*Council Response:* The site is currently allocated as Countryside outside the settlement boundary.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

*Representation Text:* No.

*Council Response:* RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE) 97/0004 23/04/1997 Refused

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE) - RESUBMISSION FOLLOWING PREVIOUS REFUSAL 97/1049 25/02/1998 REFUSED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Latest?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2049.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>30/04/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land south of Meadowlands Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**

The land south of Meadowlands Close is advanced as a Candidate Site for residential development in the forthcoming LDP. Parc Seymour is an attractive and popular settlement and limited expansion to it on this site would assist in supporting the village without any detrimental impact in landscape terms. The site sits discretely in the wider landscape and related well to the built up area. Development on the site would also assist in providing for a range and choice of housing sites for the Newport area. The site is also deliverable and is likely to be attractive to potential developers even in the current economic climate. It could, therefore, be developed in the earlier part of the plan period.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.
It is recommended that the site does not go forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:

- Adjacent to an Archeologically Sensitive Area and within Gwent Levels Historic Landscape Characterisation Area Trowbridge: "a very remote area of landscape"-development likely to significantly affect the character of the area as would be a large increase in existing settlement size (especially cumulatively with Marshfield West allocation);
- Bordered by SSSI; adjacent to SINC;
- No designated open space for recreation- likely to lead to negative effects, from use of countryside areas for recreation, on designated sites for nature conservation;
- Flood Zone C1;
- Likely to lead to significant increase in traffic dependent on volume of residential provision proposed- recommend development only be permitted if can be proven that public transport can be improved to increased frequency to centres of employment and the railway station;
- Flood Zone C1;
- May affect SPA; RAMSAR;
- Would lead to loss of agricultural land and therefore employment in rural area- suggest site should include a mix of uses to include employment;
- Likely to lead to significant increase in traffic dependent on volume of residential provision proposed- recommend development only be permitted if can be proven that public transport can be improved to increased frequency to centres of employment and the railway station;

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council's strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council's strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for mixed tenure residential on Church Farm

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
- **Representation Text:** Approx. 50 acres - 20.24 Ha.
- **Council Response:** 20.7

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- **Representation Text:** Agricultural land forming part of Church Farm. Land is level and has never flooded.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text:** Agricultural

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text:** Residential with social housing

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No. Currently in agricultural use.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. All land used for grazing livestock and is understood to be Grade 2/3
- **Council Response:** Welsh Government comment: A pre revision survey at the site found Grades 2, 3a and 3b. The Salwick soils will possibly be BMV whereas the Newchurch soils are unlikely to be BMV. Moderate Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** Land is grassed with no specific features apart from established reens as shown on plans. Site boundary is adjacent to residential development at Marshfield.
- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Mature trees to be retained as far as possible.
- **Council Response:** TPO 07/94 Horse Chestnut, 07/94 Yew, 07/94 Horse Chestnut, 07/94 Elm. Potential TPOs
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for mixed tenure residential on Church Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</th>
<th>Representation Text: Established reens and surrounding area to be retained together with established trees.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td>Yes. Part of site to be designated as green space for environmental and leisure purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.16 Archaeology?</td>
<td>No. Not to the best of our knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong> Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.2 Greenfield?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?</td>
<td>No. Part of site is low lying and is drained by established reens. This land is proposed for access to main site only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong> Zone C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td>Yes. Several reens pass through lower land -see plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td>No. Land is firm topsoil over sandstone and rock with high load bearing capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.7 SSSI?</td>
<td>Yes. Part of low lying land is understood to be subject to SSSI restrictions this area to be excluded from future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong> SSSI Gwent Levels - St Brides.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.8 Protected Species?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Question: 3.9**

**Representation Text:** No. Not to the best of our knowledge

**Council Response:**
- No, Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1**

**Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Site is divided by Church Lane and is adjacent to Ty Mawr Lane. Farm access is provided from each of these roads. Existing highways are considered adequate for proposed development.

**Council Response:** Yes - Church Lane

No - Church lane is very narrow, lack of footways. Lack of passing bays. Visibility onto Marshfield Road is poor.

**Question: 4.10**

**Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- Open space and links between Marshfield and St Mary's Church to be provided.

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required, provided to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11**

**Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- Foot and vehicular access to be provided within development.

**Question: 4.2**

**Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** Approx 275m.

**Council Response:** Marshfield Road. 400m -1km

**Question: 4.3**

**Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** Regular throughout day

**Council Response:** 1-2 Hr Frequency

**Question: 4.4**

**Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:** Cardiff/Newport - 5/6 miles

**Council Response:** Newport - 10km
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for mixed tenure residential on Church Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
- **Representation Text:** Premier general store situated in Marshfield approx. 300m from site.
- **Council Response:** Marshfield Road P.O + shop Minimum - 500m edge of site.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
- **Representation Text:** Some services provided in Marshfield / Castleton. Site close to Newport/Cardiff.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- **Representation Text:** Foot & Cycle paths to be provided within proposed development.
- **Council Response:** No footways on Church Lane

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Public footpaths provided across site and adjacent to boundary. Footpaths coloured green on plan.
- **Council Response:** PROW 399/4, 399/4 PROW FPs 399/43 399/44 399/49

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- **Representation Text:** Designated open space in Marshfield. Further provision to be provided within site.
- **Council Response:** The site has no open space in its nearby vicinity

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Primary school in Marshfield. Secondary schools in Basseleg and Newport.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- **Representation Text:** No. No discussions with community representatives to date.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- **Representation Text:** To be addressed in preliminary discussions prior to development.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Existing service capacity understood to be sufficient to serve proposed development.

**Welsh Water Comments:**

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representation Text:**
No.

### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representation Text:**
Existing residential site in Marshfield adjacent to site opportunity for logical development between St Mary's Church and Marshfield.

**Council Response:**
The site is located outside Village Boundary

### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for mixed tenure residential on Church Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Site wholly owned by proposer family.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** No. Adjoining agricultural land subject to short term agricultural lease by proposer

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. 4-6 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Site is proposed for inclusion within proposed LDP.

**Council Response:** This site is allocated as Countryside within the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:** The land shown edged red on the attached site plan is put forward for whole or part inclusion in the Newport Local Development Plan 2011-2026 subject to planning permission the proposed considers the land to be suitable for small scale residential development. The land lies within the junction of Marshfield road and Ty Mawr lane and is divided by Church lane. The majority of the land is level and of good bearing capacity, and lies between existing residential development of Marshfield and the village church of St Mary's. The lower part of the land is drained by established reens and is offered for access and amenity purposes in conjunction with proposed development.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for mixed tenure residential on Church Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** Map Included?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Rep'n/Para/Policy | AccessnNo | DateLodgd | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified | Summary |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for mixed tenure residential development on Church Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 115/ Church Farm (small site)

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:** It is recommended that the site does not go forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:

- Adjacent to an Archeologically Sensitive Area and within Gwent Levels Historic Landscape Characterisation Area Trowbridge: Trowbridge: “a very remote area of landscape”- development likely to significantly affect the character of the area as would be a large increase in existing settlement size (especially cumulatively with Marshfield West allocation);
- Bordered by SSSI; adjacent to SINC;
- No designated open space for recreation- likely to lead to negative effects, from use of countryside areas for recreation, on designated sites for nature conservation;
- Flood Zone C1;
- May affect SPA; RAMSAR;
- Would lead to loss of agricultural land and therefore employment in rural area- suggest site should include a mix of uses to include employment;
- Likely to lead to significant increase in traffic dependent on volume of residential provision proposed- recommend development only be permitted if can be proven that public transport can be improved to increased frequency to centres of employment and the railway station; Increased pollution from traffic (air and noise); and
- No open space designated for recreation nearby.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:** The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question:** Site Name

**Representation Text:** Church Farm

**Question:** Location

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for mixed tenure residential development on Church Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:** Church Lane, Marshfield

**Question: 2.3** Grid Reference
- **Representation Text:** ST2682NW
- **Council Response:** 326088 162406

**Question: 2.4** Site Area
- **Representation Text:** Approx. 2acres - 0.81Ha
- **Council Response:** 4.07ha

**Question: 2.5** Brief Description
- **Representation Text:** Established farm yard containing various buildings & hardstanding. Site is level & well drained.

**Question: 2.6** Current Use
- **Representation Text:** Agricultural

**Question: 2.7** Proposed Use(s)
- **Representation Text:** Small scale residential to contain proportion of social housing.

**Question: 3.1** Brownfield?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Established farm yard

**Question: 3.10** Minerals Safeguarding Area?
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11** Agricultural Land?
- **Representation Text:** Site is in agricultural use as established farm yard, hardstanding and buildings.

**Question: 3.12** Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
- **Representation Text:** Site is adjacent to Church Lane and adjoining St Mary's Church, Marshfield. Local landscape is grassed and is close to Marshfield.
- **Council Response:** Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13** Trees and Hedgerows?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C2</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for mixed tenure residential development on Church Farm

**Representation Text:**

*Yes.* Some mature trees adjoin site - these will be retained as part of any development.

**Council Response:**

*Yes.* There are no TPOs on the site Potential TPOs

---

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

**Representation Text:**

- Some mature trees adjoin site - these will be retained as part of any development.

**Council Response:**

- Site would form small residential development adjacent to churchyard and all features would be retained.

---

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:**

*Yes.* Part of site to form green space for public use adjacent to St Mary’s Churchyard.

---

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Council Response:**

The site is partly within an archaeologically sensitive area.

---

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

---

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

---

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Council Response:**

Zone C1 for flood risk.

---

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

---

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

**Council Response:**

Site is well drained with established buildings and hardstanding.

---

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

---

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:**

No.
### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:**
- Listed building: n/a
- Ancient monuments: n/a
- Historic park: n/a
- Conservation area: n/a

**Council Response:**
- Within Newport boundary

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:**
- Yes - Church Lane
- No - Narrow, poor surface, lack of passing places, no footways.

**Council Response:**
- Public road is considered capable of supporting additional traffic from small development.

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?

**Representation Text:**
- Small area of open space to be provided on site; possibly linked to St Mary's Church as required.

**Council Response:**
- The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. The proposed development is approximately 650m from the nearest play provision so a LEAP would be required on-site to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development, with off-site contributions for formal play facilities locally.

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?

**Representation Text:**
- Approx. 275m from bus stop.

**Council Response:**
- Marshfield Road - 400m

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?

**Representation Text:**
- Regular bus services throughout the day.

**Council Response:**
- 1-2 hours frequency

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?

**Representation Text:**
- Cardiff/Newport 5/6 miles.

**Council Response:**
- Newport

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?

**Representation Text:**
- Premier General Store situated in Marshfield approx. 300m from site.

**Council Response:**
- Marshfield Road - Post Office and store. 550m
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for mixed tenure residential development on Church Farm

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** Some community services provided in Marshfield/Castleton site close to Newport/Cardiff.

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** Public road adjoins small site.
- **Council Response:** No footways on Church Lane

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** Footpath crosses edge of site - coloured green on plan.
- **Council Response:** PROW 399/44
- **Council Response:** PROW FP 399/44

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?
- **Representation Text:** Designated open spaces provided in Marshfield approx. 300-400m from site.
- **Council Response:** The site has no open space in its nearby vicinity

### Question: 5.1 Schools?
- **Representation Text:** Primary school in Marshfield. Secondary schools in Basseleg and Newport.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:** To be addressed in preliminary discussions prior to development.

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
- **Representation Text:** As 5.2.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
- **Representation Text:** Mains water & electricity available on site. Mains gas available adjacent to Church farm. Main sewer situated in Marshfield.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

16/02/2012
Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

Rep’n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
2050.C2 01/05/2009 P W MP

Summary: Candidate site for mixed tenure residential development on Church Farm

Representation Text: Yes. Existing service capacity understood to be sufficient to serve proposed development.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated within the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: A small residential development previously existed around St. Mary’s Church. Small scale development would enhance the Church which is isolated from the village.

Council Response: the site is outside of the village boundary

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text: Development would provide opportunity for development between St Mary’s Church and Marshfield.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050.C2</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for mixed tenure residential development on Church Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- Representation Text: Yes. Adjoining land is currently farmed by the proposer.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- Representation Text: Yes. 4-6 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- Representation Text: Yes. Site is proposed for inclusion within Local Development Plan.
- Council Response: The site is allocated as Countryside and Green Wedge

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
- Representation Text: The land edged red on the attached site plan is put forward for whole or part inclusion in the Newport Local Development Plan 2011-2026. The site is level and is currently used as farmyard and outbuildings for Church Farm, Marshfield. The site adjoins Church Lane and is immediately adjacent to St Mary's Church, which is separated from the village. In former years a small residential community existed around St Mary's Church, but all formal cottages have now been demolished. Access and services are available to the site.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
- Representation Text: Yes.
2051 Langstone Village Hall

Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
2051.C1 05/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Candidate site for new community centre, various community facilities including open space provision on Langstone Court Road.

Site: 116/ Langstone Court Road

Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites

Question: SA Recommendation
 Council Response: C2 in part of site: it is recommended that this part of the site is not developed and that green infrastructure is provided within the site to include SUDS.
- SINC designated areas; close to SSSI: buffer areas should be created to avoid potential harm to these sites.
- Primary facilities community hall and open space (inc. „various community facilities“ unspecified) to be provided as part of development- suggest some employment is also provided as part of the development (this could be in the form of live/work units).
- Scheduled Ancient Monument; borders ASA: buffer areas free from development should be created if appropriate to retain the integrity and value of archaeological assets.
- May harm potential of tourism assets including historic and environmental features: it should be ensured that the potential of the area of tourism development is investigated and realised onsite.

Question: Overall Council Response
 Council Response: The need to relocate and enlarge Langstone village hall and provide more accessible open space is noted. The size of the proposed site at 1.5 hectares is considerably larger than that needed for a community centre use. There is a shortfall in open space in the langstone ward and the addition of open space by way of this proposal would be welcomed. Extending the boundary in this location however would provide for an acceptance in principle for development to occur in this location. As the land is open countryside this should not be the case. Further to this, the Council would need sufficient evidence to show delivery of the community centre within the plan period and this has not been provided at the present time. The Council would prefer to see the conversion of building for community uses rather than new build especially in more rural locations, like this one. The development of a community facilities outside of settlement boundaries would fall to be considered under other criteria based polices in this plan. An extension of the settlement boundary in this location is therefore not warranted.

Question: 2.1 Site Name
 Representation Text: Proposed site for re-location of Langstone Village Hall

Question: 2.2 Location
 Representation Text: To the east of Langstone Court Road between A48 and the M4 motorway.

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference
 Representation Text: ST 37253; 89767
 Council Response: 337346 189747

Question: 2.4 Site Area
 Representation Text: 1.5 ha
 Council Response: 7.74ha
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2051.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for new community centre, various community facilities including open space provision on Langstone Court Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

Representation Text: The site is bounded by Langstone Court Road to the West, the M4 motorway embankment to the south and a small stream along the north side. The site is level.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

Representation Text: Rough Pasture

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text: New community centre for the residents of Langstoen, with provision for sports facilities, local shop, post office and public open spaces.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text: Yes. Grade 4 - permanent grassland/rough grazing (DEFRA Agricultural Land Classification)

Council Response: Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. There is a low probability of BMV at this site. A previous desk exercise predicted the best grade is likely to be 3a.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Representation Text: Site has housing developments to the north and the west. The motorway embankment to the south is the dominant feature in this area.


**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

Representation Text: No. There are no mature trees or hedgerows that would be affected by the proposed development

Council Response: Hedgerow trees with TPO potential

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

Representation Text: The project will include landscaping works designed to attract, retain and enhance biodiversity features within and near the site.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

Representation Text: No. The location is not urban but semi-rural
Summary: Candidate site for new community centre, various community facilities including open space provision on Langstone Court Road.

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
Representation Text: Yes. From Langstone Court Road take the footpath eastwards along the north side of the motorway embankment for about 150 metres. On your left hand side you will see the remains of a rectangular moated enclosure, with a small stream across its north side. It has an inner and outer bank, both of which have been destroyed in the south east. The outer bank has been partially destroyed in the south west. It is a scheduled ancient monument. An archaeological watching brief on a sewerage improvement scheme carried out in 1991 considered that despite earlier suggestions it is unlikely that the earthwork had been a moated manor house or settlement. It was more likely that the feature was a stock enclosure and would have been topped by a fence.

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Adjacent to medieval moated site, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Restraint. Archaeological evaluation carried out. Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. The area could be allocated in LDP subject to conditions and with proviso that the impact on the setting of the scheduled monument could restrict development.

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
Representation Text: Yes. It is land not previously developed

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
Representation Text: No. Site does not feature on Environment Agency map of areas at risk of flooding. It assesses the risk of flooding for this site each year from rivers or sea to be 0.1% (1 in 1000) or less.

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
Representation Text: No. None known

Question: 3.7 SSSI?
Representation Text: Yes. There is a scheduled ancient monument to the east of the proposed site

Council Response: There are no SINC/SAC etc affecting the site

Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
Representation Text: No. No record of any protected species

Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
Representation Text: No. There is a scheduled ancient monument to the east of the proposed site.
### New Access

**Access to Highway?**

Yes. Access would be off Langstone Court Road close to its junction with the A48. This road serves the new Court Meadow housing development. The highway is capable of supporting the modest anticipated increase in traffic which will be outside normal peak periods.

**Council Response:**

Yes. New access required to provide min visibility splay of 2.4 x 4.5 metres onto Langstone Court Road. No access to Chepstow Road.

### Open Space Linkage Improvement

**Representation Text:**

The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. Langstone Village has grown in recent years and the existing community facilities are limited and this proposal will help contribute to the existing and future need. The provision of a community facility conforms to the sustainability agenda (reducing car travel) which is the thrust of WAG planning policy.

**Council Response:**

The development would encourage access to the archaeological sites in the vicinity as described above and encourage the use of the existing open space.

### Public Transport Connectivity Improvement

**Representation Text:**

A bus stop is located nearby and therefore the development would be likely to encourage the use of public transport.

### Bus Route

**Representation Text:**

Approximately 20 metres.

**Council Response:**

200 metres

### Bus Frequency

**Representation Text:**

Approximately 3-4 buses per hour in each direction along the A48

**Council Response:**

20-30 min frequency

### Railway Station

**Representation Text:**

Newport railway station is approximately 6 km away

**Council Response:**

newport station

### Convenience Shop

**Representation Text:**

The nearest shop is 1 km away. There is also a pub and a petrol station at this location

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2051.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
<td>Late?</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status Modified</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for new community centre, various community facilities including open space provision on Langstone Court Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

950m to garage shop

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

*Representation Text:* The site has good communication links via A48 to Newport and once developed will provide a community resource for the residents of Langstone. The development is also likely to create limited job opportunities.

**Council Response:**

The development would be within walking and cycling distance for a significant proportion of Langstone residents and the provision of cycle parking would encourage the use of cycles.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. There is a northern footpath (no.18) running along the northern boundary and a bridleway (BR21) running along the southern boundary.

*Council Response:* Bridleway 394/2 Footway 394/1 394/18 21

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

*Representation Text:* The proposed site adjoins open space to the north of the motorway embankment.

*Council Response:* There is informal open space at Langstone Recreation Grounds and the Nurseries North and South Site

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Langstone Primary School lies 1.3 km to the northeast. The existing village hall lies 0.3 km to the east

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Limited consultation about this site has been generally supportive

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

*Representation Text:* A Village survey carried out in the summer of 2007 was strongly in favour of a new multi-use community centre

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

*Representation Text:* No. There are no facilities currently at the site as it is previously undeveloped land.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

*Representation Text:* Services run through the site and along the adjacent A48 trunk road.
### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

No. The proposed site has residential development on two sides. Traffic congestion is unlikely to be an issue as the number of projected visits is relatively small and not at peak periods. The existing development on the north side uses a different access route. Compared with the M4 motorway noise will not be a significant issue.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Yes. The development is non-residential and will be replacing a similar nearby facility. The majority of users already live in Langstone.

#### Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water Supply**

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

**Nash Waste Water Treatment Works**

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.
In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: Existing residential developments in the Langstone area suffer from a lack of community facilities. The existing village hall was built in 1950. Since then the number of households has increased dramatically and the aspirations of the villagers have risen accordingly.

Council Response: The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text: This would not add to pressures nor provide opportunities for further development in the immediate vicinity. There are existing housing developments nearby and plans have already been approved for additional housing development adjacent to the Coldra roundabout. The building of a community centre at this location would prevent future pressures to develop adjacent land for housing or business use.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

Representation Text: No. This submission has been discussed in general terms with the Welsh Assembly Government who jointly owned the site with Persimmon Builders.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

Representation Text: No. The site is one of very few sites in the centre of Langstone suitable for a new Community Centre.

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

Representation Text: Yes. The Trustees have an interest in the existing Langstone Village Hall - OS ref: ST 37483; 89927

Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

Representation Text: No. We are not aware of any restrictive covenants on the proposed site.

Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?

Representation Text: Yes. We would expect to commence development within 7 to 10 years. This would allow time to acquire the site, consultations, design and funding.

Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

Representation Text: No. The site is currently allocated as Countryside within the UDP and is outside the settlement boundary
### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
**Representation Text:**
No. None known

### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
**Representation Text:**
No. None known

### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
**Representation Text:**
No. None known

### Question: 8 Other Information?
**Representation Text:**
Langstone has grown in size significantly since the building of its original village hall which no longer provides an adequate community resource. The age of the building and lack of space to add additional facilities at its current location means that it is not suitable for redevelopment to meet the needs of the much larger and more diverse community that now lives in Langstone. The site is within 200 yards of the existing village hall and therefore provides an opportunity to provide enhanced facilities at a location that is still relatively central to the village.

### Question: 9 Map Included?
**Representation Text:**
Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2053.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for retail and/or hotel and conference facilities on Imperial Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** Imperial Park

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

---

### Question: Representation Texts

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
- It is recommended that only the previously developed sites are considered for development. Development in the ASA should be avoided where possible.
- Public open space should be provided as part of development, especially where development includes residential provision or employment.
- It should be ensured that there will be no net increase in surface water runoff as a result of development to reduce the increased risk of flooding through the development of the greenfield site, especially where this may include sensitive uses such as residential accommodation.
- It should be ensured that the mix of uses provided on site cover the full range of community services and facilities required within walking distance including those in Table 3.4.

---

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
- The allocation of the site for retail purposes would be contrary to both national and local policies which are clear in promoting a city centre first approach to the consideration of retail proposals. Major out-of-town or out-of-centre retail schemes are not regarded as likely to be necessary during the plan period. The Retail Study carried out for the Council and Newport Unlimited in 2010 by Colliers International clearly demonstrates this. It is therefore recommended that the site is not allocated for retail purposes as it would be contrary to one of the Plan's key strategy elements - the regeneration of the retail core of the city.

- With regards to the proposed hotel use, the site currently functions as a developed employment site. There are no specific development plan allocations relating to the site. An application for a hotel use could be submitted at any time and assessed against the relevant policies of the plan. On this basis, there is not considered to be a need to specifically allocate the land for a hotel use.

---

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Imperial Park, Newport

---

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Celtic Way, Newport

---

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** Easting - 327838 / Northing - 184514

**Council Response:** 327840 184470

---

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:** 6.9 Hectares

**Council Response:** 6.75ha

---

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2053.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for retail and/or hotel and conference facilities on Imperial Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation Text: Currently developed as B8 Use

Question: 2.6  
Current Use

Representation Text: Storage and Distribution

Question: 2.7  
Proposed Use(s)

Representation Text: Retail and/or Hotel and Conferencing Facilities

Question: 3.1  
Brownfield?

Representation Text: Yes. Storage and Distribution

Question: 3.10  
Minerals Safeguarding Area?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.11  
Agricultural Land?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.12  
Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

Representation Text: The site is currently developed and the landscape within the site is managed.

Council Response: Countryside comments: No specific countryside issues however detailed considerations to be agreed for retention of the landscape planting and screening and further enhancement works.

Question: 3.13  
Trees and Hedgerows?

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Hedgerow trees with TPO potential

Question: 3.14  
Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

Representation Text: Effective hard and soft landscaping of the proposed development would improve the landscape of the site.

Question: 3.15  
Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.16  
Archaeology?

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Site of Post-medieval Dyffryn House that may have medieval precursor. Restraint. Archaeological evaluation carried out.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2053.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for retail and/or hotel and conference facilities on Imperial Park

Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.7 SSSI?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

Representation Text: No.

Council Response:
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

Representation Text: Yes. The site is accessible from the A48 and is less than a mile from Junction 28 of the M4 Motorway. The A48 dual-carriage way is likely to be able to support the traffic generated from the proposed allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2053.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for retail and/or hotel and conference facilities on Imperial Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport assessment required for development.**

- No footways on Celtic way.
- Good capacity as adjacent highway.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A
- **Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site it would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

- **Representation Text:** The site is already within 50m of public transport links

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

- **Representation Text:** 50m
- **Council Response:** Adjacent to site. 280m to bus stop

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

- **Representation Text:** Around 8 buses per hour (number 36 to Newport City Centre and the number 30 from Cardiff - Newport)
- **Council Response:** A48- 10 minute frequency

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

- **Representation Text:** 4 miles (Newport Central Station)
- **Council Response:** Newport

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

- **Representation Text:** See cover letter (see section 8)
- **Council Response:** Greggs- Lakeside Drive -600m
  Asda Duffryn - 2km

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- **Representation Text:** Accessible to large scale employment occupiers

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

- **Representation Text:** Potentially as part of a Travel Plan etc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Poly</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2053.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for retail and/or hotel and conference facilities on Imperial Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

No footways on Celtic way. Hway + Cycleway on A48.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

Representation Text: N/A

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

Representation Text: N/A

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

Representation Text: Creation of additional employment opportunities

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

Representation Text: Provisions currently on site

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Representation Text: Yes.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling
A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2053.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. 1-3 years
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**
The site is currently white land within the settlement boundary

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

Relevant planning history on adjacent sites:

- **CONSTRUCTION OF 1.4KM OF DUAL CARRIAGEWAY (PART OF SOUTHERN DISTRIBUTOR ROAD - WEST DUFFRYN LINK) INCLUDING 4 ROUNDBOATS TWO SINGLE CARRIAGEWAY LINKS TO PERCOED LANE AND ASSOCIATED EARTHWORKS INCLUDING THE CULVERTING OF EXISTING REENS, CREATION OF SETTLEMENT PONDS AND LANDSCAPING WORKS (INVOLVING THE DIVERSION OF PUBLIC FOOTPATH NOS. 13, 14,15 & 19) – REF 96/0677**

Summary: Candidate site for retail and/or hotel and conference facilities on Imperial Park
Dear Sir I Madam,

Imperial Park, Newport
Candidate Site Representation

Savills have been instructed by Curzon Industrial Partners Ltd to promote land at Imperial Park, Newport as a Candidate Site for consideration as part of the forthcoming Local Development Plan (LDP). The completed Candidate Site forms and a site location plan (scale 1:5000) are enclosed.

Introduction and context
Imperial Park consists of a range of high quality B8 and warehousing units. It is located adjacent to Junction 28 of the M4 motorway and is accessed from the A48. The site is located within an area identified for economic growth (UDP Policy ED1) and adjoins the adopted UDP employment allocations at Duffryn (Policy ED1 (i)) and Cleppa Park (Policy ED2 (ii)).

The site, the subject of this candidate site submission, consists of two of the five units at Imperial Park (Units IP1 and IP2). The park was developed in 1997 as part of the larger LG electronics complex. Furthermore there are opportunities for expansion and new development on the site.

As such, this representation proposes that the existing units (IP1 & IP2) should be allocated for retailing (Use Class A1) and a hotel (Use Class C1) which would be a new build development on additional land within the site boundary.

The current position on the site
The site currently consists of a total floorspace of 132,750 sq ft for Class 88 (storage and distribution) use. The units occupy prominent locations fronting the A48 dual carriageway. The site benefits from a number of sustainability credentials - including its accessible location and excellent bus links, brownfield nature and proximity to residential areas.

There have been a considerable number of high quality office developments in this area of Newport over the last 10 - 15 years, and current occupiers in the vicinity include the Welsh Assembly Government, the Home Office and Lloyds TSB. There is accordingly an opportunity therefore to develop ancillary uses in this area - including a hotel I conferencing facilities and 1 or retail.

Most importantly, if the proposed allocation was successful, over 350,000 sq. ft, would remain available to let for prevailing uses on the site, within the ownership of the applicant.
Planning Policy Context

The adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006) proposals map does not allocate the site for any particular use, it is therefore ‘white land’ within the settlement boundary. Furthermore, there is not a planning policy in place that specifically protects existing employment uses per se. We are aware however, of the criteria set out in Policy ED3 ‘Reappraising the Supply of Employment Land’ of the UDP against which proposals for alternative uses of employment land will be assessed.

It is not considered that the proposed allocation for alternative uses on the site conflict with the above mentioned criteria. In addressing such criteria, please note the following points:
- The proposed allocation is likely to increase the level of employment provision on this site;
- A sufficient supply of land for Use Class 08 will remain in the vicinity, not least in the ownership of the applicant;
- The alternative use is suitable and takes into account adjacent or surrounding uses;
- The proposed scale, location and design of any development within this allocation will be appropriate;
- There are no significant access implications;
- The allocation (and any subsequent development) would improve the amenities of local residents;
- The site is not affected by ground, air or noise pollution;

The Potential for Retailing

The site is considered to be both sustainable and accessible offering a potential location for a retail (including food) allocation due to its proximity to areas of employment, thus enabling potential linked trips. Indeed, any positive effect of potential linked trips can also be maximized and enhanced by a number of specific measures which can be built into, and form an integral part of any proposal for the site. There is currently a lack of provision of local ancillary and complementary uses for the employees of Imperial Park and the wider employment area including Celtic Springs Business Park.

In terms of the proposed retail allocation, we are aware that the retail need and capacity of the area is a key consideration in terms of convenience, comparison and bulky goods.

The area south of Newport (including the residential areas of Tredegar Park, Maesglas and Gaer) is currently poorly served by food retail provision. A retail provision in this location would provide a more accessible and sustainable option for people in this locality.

We are conscious that, in terms of the UDP period, the Retail Capacity Assessment (2004) by DTZ identifies a limited capacity for new convenience floorspace - 2,300 sq m in 2011 rising to up to 4,100 sq m in 2016. It is understood that this forecast does not include the expansion of Tesco at Spytty or the Asda store at the Cattle Market site. Notwithstanding this, we are conscious that there will be a need to account for the elongated time scales associated with the LDP period (up to 2026) and also to address any population increases arising from new residential development which will come forward during the plan period.

There is also an opportunity for the provision of a comparison / bulky goods allocation at this location. We are aware that the available expenditure for comparison goods is much greater than for convenience goods (for 2011). The site is easily accessible from the M4 motorway and benefits from potential retail frontage on to the A48.

The Potential for a Hotel / Conferencing Facilities
The site at Imperial Park also provides an opportunity for a hotel and conferencing facility. Such an allocation would complement the office uses in the surrounding area and allow for them to function efficiently, attract occupiers and maintain and enhance the current commercial appeal of the location and wider area.

An allocation for C1 use (hotel) on the site would be in accordance with existing UDP policy and regeneration objectives to encourage the development of land already available and maximise economic development opportunities in Newport (we do not anticipate that this policy will be subject to any fundamental change during the LDP process). As such, it is considered that a hotel and conferencing facility at this location would broadly conform with the criteria set out in Policy ED13 'Tourism Development' - the site could be accessed by a range and choice of transportation options and any proposal would be of an appropriate scale and design for its locality.

Summary
It is our consideration that there is a genuine opportunity for the allocation of an alternative use, such as retail &/or hotel & conferencing facility, at Imperial Park. Such uses would be compatible and supportive of the numerous office developments in the vicinity (in Duffryn and Cleppa Park). Accordingly, the improved mix of uses and facilities for employees in the area ought to increase the commercial appeal of the area and act as catalyst for further investment.

I trust the above assists in providing you with an insight into the potential options available for the site. We would welcome the opportunity of a meeting so that the proposals can be discussed in further detail.

If there is anything further that you require to process the submission of this candidate site representation please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely
William Rimell
Planner

Question: 9
Map Included? Yes.
It is recommended that the site does not go forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:
- Flood Zone C1;
- May affect SPA; RAMSAR;
- Part of site is within SSSI; adjacent to SINC;
- Likely to lead to significant increase in traffic dependent on volume of residential provision proposed- recommend development only be permitted if can be proven that public transport can be improved to increased frequency to centres of employment and the railway station;
- Within Archeologically Sensitive Area and Gwent Levels Historic Landscape Characterisation Area Trowbridge: Trowbridge: "a very remote area of landscape)k development likely to significantly affect the character of the area as would be a large increase in existing settlement size (especially cumulatively with Marshfield East allocation); and
- Increased pollution from traffic (air and noise).

The site is outside of the proposed settlement boundary for Casteton and in the proposed Wentlooge levels Special Landscape Area.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2057.C1</td>
<td>325430</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>325430 183462</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential development on Walk Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
Representation Text: 
Council Response: 0.53 Ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
Representation Text: Old Ston Barn

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
Representation Text: None

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
Representation Text: Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
Representation Text: Yes. Farm Barn

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
Representation Text: No

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
Representation Text: Haybarn

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
Representation Text: Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
Representation Text: No
Council Response: Hedgerows present.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2057.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2057.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

- **Status:** M - Made
- **Mode:** W - Written

**Summary:** Candidate Site for residential development on Walk Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.15</th>
<th>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.16</th>
<th>Archaeology?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Walk Farm is a post-medieval farm and may have a medieval precursor. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.2</th>
<th>Greenfield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.3</th>
<th>Contaminated Land Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.4</th>
<th>Flood Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.5</th>
<th>Adjacent to Water Course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.6</th>
<th>Topography / Stability Problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.7</th>
<th>SSSI?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.8</th>
<th>Protected Species?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.9</th>
<th>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Listed building n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2057.C1</td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate Site for residential development on Walk Farm

- **Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
  - **Representation Text:** Yes.
  - **Council Response:**
    - Access track to A48 - unadopted.
    - No - Access onto 50mph A48. Poor visibility, lack of turning facilities, deceleration lane etc. unsuitable

- **Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
  - **Representation Text:**
  - **Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. Owing to the small size of the site an off-site contributions for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

- **Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
  - **Representation Text:**

- **Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
  - **Representation Text:** 100 mtrs
  - **Council Response:** A48 -150m

- **Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
  - **Representation Text:** Every 30 min
  - **Council Response:** 10-20 min frequency

- **Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
  - **Representation Text:** 10 mile
  - **Council Response:** Newport -9km

- **Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
  - **Representation Text:** 1/4 mile One
  - **Council Response:** A48- garage + shop 360m

---

16/02/2012
Representation Text: Candidate Site for residential development on Walk Farm

Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

Question: 4.9 Open Space?

Question: 5.1 Schools?

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Interest in Adjoining Land? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Restrictive Covenants? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Realistic Timescale?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Development Boundary Change? No. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Unimplemented Planning Permissions? No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Planning Application Refusals? No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Planning Applications Pending? No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other Information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Map Included? 16/02/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2057.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/2009</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate Site for residential development on Walk Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation Text: Yes.
2059  Llanvaches Community Council

Summary: Candidate site for the protection of land in front of South View, Llanvaches

Site: 119/  South View, Llanvaches

Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites

Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response: The protection of land for amenity space (2059.C1) is supported in sustainability term 2075.C2. The assessment in Table 3.5 is based on candidate site 2074.C1.

- It should be ensured that development seeks to minimise its effect on landscape quality and PROWs. This could be achieved through the implementation of extensive green infrastructure. As part of this, existing trees and hedges should be retained.
- It should be ensured that the setting of the listed building is not affected by development.
- It is recommended that the development of the site includes a convenience store due to its relatively remote location.
- Improvements to public transport and walking and cycling routes should be ensured ahead of development being permitted.

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: Accepted. It is proposed that this land is safeguarded as Environmental Space in the Local Development Plan.

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Council Response: 343221 191760

Question: 2.4 Site Area

Council Response: 0.13ha

Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

Council Response: Countryside Comments: Land use uncertain. Parking should be more sensitively incorporated into open space if it is to remain.

Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

Council Response: TPO potential

Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating LDP.

Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

Council Response: Not at Flood Risk

Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2059.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for the protection of land in front of South View, Llanvaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
- **Council Response:** The Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. This site does not currently contribute to the outdoor play provision across the City as verges and commons fall outside the definition of outdoor play as provided by Fields In Trust (formerly NPFA).

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- **Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- **Council Response:** 396/38 (Byway open to all traffic (BOAT))

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
- **Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments
  - The green and open space allocations will have no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there would be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Changes?**
- **Council Response:** The site is currently allocated as environmental space within the village boundary

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

16/02/2012
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2059.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for the protection of land in front of South View, Llanvaches

1. Land in front of South View
2. The Church, Churchyard and Church Hall
3. The Village Green at the corner of Wentwood Drive and Rectory Road
4. The Recreation Field linked to Wentwood Drive
5. The Football Field alongside Millbrook Lane.

The land in front of the houses in South View is an open space and tarmaced area that forms a car park for the residents. There is nowhere else for the residents to park. The designation must remain unchanged.

The church, church yard and church hall are in full constant use and superbly maintained. Obviously the designation must not be changed.

The Village Green is privately owned and it was designated as an open space for road safety and amenity purposes when the village was developed in the 1950s. After the 1974 reorganisation the land was offered to Newport Borough Council by the owner by the Council refused to adopt it. For at least 20 years the land has been maintained by the Community Council and for some 15 years the land has been occupied by the Community Council - in that seats and a notice board were installed on The Green. Currently we occupy the land with seats, a notice board, paved areas, a raised garden, planted trees, a horde of daffodils and the Millennium Stone. Any proposed change of designation would be met with very strong opposition. Indeed, we probably now have a good claim on the land by 'adverse possession'.

The Recreation Field is owned by Newport City Council and leased to the Community Council on a 990 year lease - it has some 960 years to run! We cannot envisage any circumstances in which we might be persuaded to surrender the field.

The Football Field is glebeland owned by The Church in Wales. The Community Council rents the field on a rolling annual lease with a renewal date in February. It is vital that we retain the field for recreation purposes. It gives us the ability to separate the more boisterous activities such as rugby and soccer from the facilities for the younger children in the Recreation Field. Obviously no-one is prevented from using the Recreation Field by, being especially mindful of safety aspects, we have banned all hard ball games in this field. A ban which is successful without enforcement.

In the past, rumoured threats to our use of the Football Field have been met with demands for Village Meetings. And these have been very well attended. Any effort to remove the amenity status from the field would be met with immense local opposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2059.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for the protection of The Church, Churchyard and Church Hall in Llanvaches

Site: 120/ The Church, Churchyard and Church Hall, Llanvaches

Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites
Candidate Site for the Protection of The Church, Churchyard and Church Hall in Llanvaches

**Question:** SA Recommendation

- The protection of land for amenity space (2059.C1) is supported in sustainability term 2075.C2. The assessment in Table 3.5 is based on candidate site 2074.C1.
- It should be ensured that development seeks to minimise its effect on landscape quality and PROWs. This could be achieved through the implementation of extensive green infrastructure. As part of this, existing trees and hedges should be retained.
- It should be ensured that the setting of the listed building is not affected by development.
- It is recommended that the development of the site includes a convenience store due to its relatively remote location.
- Improvements to public transport and walking and cycling routes should be ensured ahead of development being permitted.

**Council Response:**

- Accepted. It is proposed that this land is safeguarded as Environmental Space in the Local Development Plan.
Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
Council Response:
The Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. This site does not currently contribute to the outdoor play provision across the City as verges and commons fall outside the definition of outdoor play as provided by Fields In Trust (formerly NPFA).

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
Council Response: no comment

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
Council Response: no comment

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
Council Response: no comment

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
Council Response: no comment

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
Council Response: no comment

Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
Council Response: PROW 396/3

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
Council Response: Welsh Water Comments
The green and open space allocations will have no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there would be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan

Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Changes?
Council Response: The site is environmental space within the village boundary

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text:
I should like to register the community's views about the future of the 5 amenity spaces in Llanvaches shown on Inset 13 of the current plan. These amenity areas are -
1. Land in front of South View
2. The Church, Churchyard and Church Hall
3. The Village Green at the corner of Wentwood Drive and Rectory Road
4. The Recreation Field linked to Wentwood Drive
Table: Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2059.C2

**Summary:** Candidate site for the protection of The Church, Churchyard and Church Hall in Llanvaches

The Football Field alongside Millbrook Lane.

- The land in from of the houses in South View is an open space and tarmaced area that forms a car park for the residents. There is nowhere else for the residents to park. The designation must remain unchanged.
- The church, churchyard and church hall are in full constant use and superbly maintained. Obviously the designation must not be changed.
- The Village Green is privately owned and it was designated as an open space for road safety and amenity purposes when the village was developed in the 1950s. After the 1974 reorganisation the land was offered to Newport Borough Council by the owner by the Council refused to adopt it. For at least 20 years the land has been maintained by the Community Council and for some 15 years the land has been occupie dby the Community Council - in that seats and a notice board were installed on The Green. Currently we occupy the land with seats, a notice board, paved areas, a raised garden, planted trees, a horde of daffodils and the Millennium Stone. Any proposed change of designation would be met with very strong opposition. Indeed, we probably now have a good claim on the land by 'adverse possession'.
- The Recreation Field is owned by Newport City Council and leased to the Community Council on a 990 year lease - it has some 960 years to run! We cannot envisage any circumstances in which we might be persuaded to surrender the field.
- The Football Field is glebeland owned by The Church in Wales. The Community Council rents the field on a rolling annual lease with a renewal date in February. It is vital that we retain the field for recreation purposes. It gives us the ability to separate the more boisterous activities such as rugby and soccer from the facilities for the younger children in the Recreation Field. Obviously no-one is prevented from using the Recreation Field by, being especially mindful of safety aspects, we have banned all hard ball games in this field. A ban which is successful without enforcement.
- In the past, rumoured threats to our use of the Football Field have been met with demands for Village Meetings. And these have been very well attended. Any effort to remove the amenity status from the field would be met with immense local opposition.

### 2059.C3

**Summary:** Candidate site for the protection of The Village Green, Llanvaches

- **Site:** 121/ The Village Green, Llanvaches
- **Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
- The protection of land for amenity space (2059.C1) is supported in sustainability term 2075.C2. The assessment in Table 3.5 is based on candidate site 2074.C1.
- It should be ensured that development seeks to minimise its effect on landscape quality and PROWs. This could be achieved through the implementation of extensive green infrastructure. As part of this, existing trees and hedges should be retained.
- It should be ensured that the setting of the listed building is not affected by development.
- It is recommended that the development of the site includes a convenience store due to its relatively remote location.
- Improvements to public transport and walking and cycling routes should be ensured ahead of development being permitted.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:** Accepted. It is proposed that this land is safeguarded as Environmental Space in the Local Development Plan.

16/02/2012
Summary: Candidate site for the protection of The Village Green, Llanvaches

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**
Council Response: 343436 191787

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
Council Response: 0.06ha

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
Council Response: Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
Council Response: The Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. This site does not currently contribute to the outdoor play provision across the City as verges and commons fall outside the definition of outdoor play as provided by Fields In Trust (formerly NPFA).

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
Council Response: no comment
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2059.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Council Response:** no comment

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

The green and open space allocations will have no impact on the public sewerage system or water supply network, as such there would be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Changes?**

**Council Response:** The site is environmental space within the village boundary

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**

- I should like to register the community's views about the future of the 5 amenity spaces in Llanvaches shown on Inset 13 of the current plan. These amenity areas are -
  1. Land in front of South View
  2. The Church, Churchyard and Church Hall
  3. The Village Green at the corner of Wentwood Drive and Rectory Road
  4. The Recreation Field linked to Wentwood Drive
  5. The Football Field alongside Millbrook Lane.

The land in front of the houses in South View is an open space and tarmaced area that forms a car park for the residents. There is nowhere else for the residents to park. The designation must remain unchanged.

The church, churchyard and church hall are in full constant use and superbly maintained. Obviously the designation must not be changed.

The Village Green is privately owned and it was designated as an open space for road safety and amenity purposes when the village was developed into he 1950s. After the 1974 reorganisation the land was offered to Newport Borough Council by the owner by the Council refused to adopt it. For at least 20 years the land has been maintained by the Community Council and for some 15 years the land has been occupie d by the Community Council and seats and a notice board were installed on The Green. Currently we occupy the land with seats, a notice board, paved areas, a raised garden, planted trees, a horde of daffodils and the Millennium Stone. Any proposed change of designation would be met with very strong opposition. Indeed, we probable now have a good claim on the land by 'adverse possession'.

The Recreation Field is owned by Newport City Council and leased to the Community Council on a 990 year lease - it has some 960 years to run! We cannot envisage any circumstances in which we might be persuaded to surrender the field.

The Football Field is glebeland owned by The Church in Wales. The Community Council rents the field on a rolling annual lease with a renewal date in February. It is vital that we retain the
field for recreation purposes. It gives us the ability to separate the more boisterous activities such as rugby and soccer from the facilities for the younger children in the Recreation Field. Obviously no-one is prevented from using the Recreation Field by, being especially mindful of safety aspects, we have banned all hard ball games in this field. A ban which is successful without enforcement.

In the past, rumoured threats to our use of the Football Field have been met with demands for Village Meetings. And these have been very well attended. Any effort to remove the amenity status from the field would be met with immense local opposition.

Site: 122/ The Recreation Field, Llanvaches

Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2059.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for the protection of The Village Green, Llanvaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for the protection of The Recreation Field, Llanvaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> SA Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td>The protection of land for amenity space (2059.C1) is supported in sustainability term 2075.C2. The assessment in Table 3.5 is based on candidate site 2074.C1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td>It should be ensured that development seeks to minimise its effect on landscape quality and PROWs. This could be achieved through the implementation of extensive green infrastructure. As part of this, existing trees and hedges should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td>It should be ensured that the setting of the listed building is not affected by development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is recommended that the development of the site includes a convenience store due to its relatively remote location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements to public transport and walking and cycling routes should be ensured ahead of development being permitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question: Overall Council Response | | |
| Council Response: | | Accepted. It is proposed that this land is safeguarded as Environment Space and excluded from the village development boundary in the Local Development Plan. |

| Question: 2.3 | Grid Reference | |
| Council Response: | | 343307 191873 |

| Question: 2.4 | Site Area | |
| Council Response: | | 0.53ha |

| Question: 3.12 | Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion? | |
| Council Response: | Countrywide Comments: | Strategic Public Open Space in open countryside. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 6 Wentwood. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues |

<p>| Question: 3.13 | Trees and Hedgerows? | |
| Council Response: | Trees with TPO potential |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2059.C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P W</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for the protection of The Recreation Field, Llanvaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

Council Response: Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

Council Response: The Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. The site being proposed contributes to the wards play audit affording informal play space 0.49Ha and equipped play provision of 0.05Ha.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

Council Response: no comment

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments
The green and open space allocations will have no impact on the publoc sewerage system or water supply network, as such there would be no objection to their inclusion with any development plan
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Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Changes?

Council Response: The site is allocated as environmental space within the village boundary.

Question: 8 Other Information?

1. Land in front of South View
2. The Church, Churchyard and Church Hall
3. The Village Green at the corner of Wentwood Drive and Rectory Road
4. The Recreation Field linked to Wentwood Drive
5. The Football Field alongside Millbrook Lane.

The land in front of the houses in South View is an open space and tarmaced area that forms a car park for the residents. There is nowhere else for the residents to park. The designation must remain unchanged.

The church, church yard and church hall are in full constant use and superbly maintained. Obviously the designation must not be changed.

The Village Green is privately owned and it was designated as an open space for road safety and amenity purposes when the village was developed in the 1950s. After the 1974 reorganisation that land was offered to Newport Borough Council by the owner by the Council refused to adopt it. For at least 20 years the land has been maintained by the Community Council and for some 15 years the land has been occupied by the Community Council in that seats and a notice board were installed on The Green. Currently we occupy the land with seats, a notice board, paved areas, a raised garden, planted trees, a horde of daffodils and the Millennium Stone. Any proposed change of designation would be met with very strong opposition. Indeed, we probably now have a good claim on the land by adverse possession.

The Recreation Field is owned by Newport City Council and leased to the Community Council on a 990 year lease it has some 960 years to run! We cannot envisage any circumstances in which we might be persuaded to surrender the field.

The Football Field is glebeland owned by The Church in Wales. The Community Council rents the field on a rolling annual lease with a renewal date in February. It is vital that we retain the field for recreation purposes. It gives us the ability to separate the more boisterous activities such as rugby and soccer from the facilities for the younger children in the Recreation Field. Obviously no-one is prevented from using the Recreation Field by, being especially mindful of safety aspects, we have banned all hard ball games in this field. A ban which is successful without enforcement.

In the past, rumoured threats to our use of the Football Field have been met with demands for Village Meetings. And these have been very well attended. Any effort to remove the amenity status from the field would be met with immense local opposition.
### Question: SA Recommendation

- The protection of land for amenity space (2059.C1) is supported in sustainability term 2075.C2. The assessment in Table 3.5 is based on candidate site 2074.C1.
- It should be ensured that development seeks to minimise its effect on landscape quality and PROWs. This could be achieved through the implementation of extensive green infrastructure. As part of this, existing trees and hedges should be retained.
- It should be ensured that the setting of the listed building is not affected by development.
- It is recommended that the development of the site includes a convenience store due to its relatively remote location.
- Improvements to public transport and walking and cycling routes should be ensured ahead of development being permitted.

### Question: Overall Council Response

Accepted. It is proposed that this land is safeguarded as Environmental Space and excluded from the village development boundary in the Local Development Plan.

### Question: Grid Reference

Council Response: 343578 191894

### Question: Site Area

Council Response: 0.29ha

### Question: Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

Council Response: Countryside Comments:
- Strategic Public Open Space in open countryside. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 6 Wentwood. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

### Question: Trees and Hedgerows?

Council Response: Trees with TPO potential

### Question: Archaeology?

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

### Question: Conservation Area or Listed Building?

Council Response: Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

### Question: Access to Highway?

Council Response: no comment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2059.C5</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for the protection of football field alongside Millbrook Lane, Llanvaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?</th>
<th>Council Response:</th>
<th>The Langstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. The site being proposed for protection contributes to the wards play audit affording formal play space of 0.28Ha.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: 4.2 Bus Route?</td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?</td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 4.4 Railway Station?</td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?</td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?</td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Changes?</td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The site is allocated as Environmental Space within the village boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 8 Other Information?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>I should like to register the community's views about the future of the 5 amenity spaces in Llanvaches shown on Inset 13 of the current plan. These amenity areas are - 1. Land in front of South View 2 The Church, Churchyard and Church Hall 3 The Village Green at the corner of Wentwood Drive and Rectory Road 4 The Recreation Field linked to Wentwood Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The land in from of the houses in South View is an open space and tarmaced area that forms a car park for the residents. There is nowhere else for the residents to park. The designation must remain unchanged.

The church, church yard and church hall are in full constant use and superbly maintained. Obviously the designation must not be changed.

The Village Green is privately owned and it was designated as an open space for road safety and amenity purposes when the village was developed in the 1950s. After the 1974 reorganisation the land was offered to Newport Borough Council by the owner by the Council refused to adopt it. For at least 20 years the land has been maintained by the Community Council and for some 15 years the land has been occupied by the Community Council in that seats and a notice board were installed on The Green. Currently we occupy the land with seats, a notice board, paved areas, a raised garden, planted trees, a horde of daffodils and the Millennium Stone. Any proposed change of designation would be met with very strong opposition. Indeed, we probably now have a good claim on the land by 'adverse possession'.

The Recreation Field is owned by Newport City Council and leased to the Community Council on a 990 year lease - it has some 960 years to run! We cannot envisage any circumstances in which we might be persuaded to surrender the field.

The Football Field is glebeland owned by The Church in Wales. The Community Council rents the field on a rolling annual lease with a renewal date in February. It is vital that we retain the field for recreation purposes. It gives us the ability to separate the more boisterous activities such as rugby and soccer from the facilities for the younger children in the Recreation Field. Obviously no-one is prevented from using the Recreation Field by, being especially mindful of safety aspects, we have banned all hard ball games in this field. A ban which is successful without enforcement.

In the past, rumoured threats to our use of the Football Field have been met with demands for Village Meetings. And these have been very well attended. Any effort to remove the amenity status from the field would be met with immense local opposition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA Recommendation</td>
<td>Council Response: May help to improve city centre investment adjacent to deprived area of Pillgwenlly; this effect should be ensured through design measures to improve accessibility and legibility. It should be ensured that clear, safe and direct walking and cycling routes are provided to connect the site to the city centre, as well as to recreational areas. Flood zone C1: SUDS should be incorporated throughout the site. Adjacent to watercourse: SSSI and SAC: any potential effects should be mitigated prior to development to ensure no negative effects. Development on the site should seek to connect to and enhance the ecological value of the area, integrating with the river corridor. Site could enhance landscape appearance next to river – it should be ensured that the design of development is sympathetic to the local environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Overall Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Candidate Site is a brownfield site located within the urban area of St Julians. It is recommended for inclusion within the Local Development Plan for residential development. The site has the potential to regenerated a previously developed site and provide a section of a continuous riverside link for the River Usk, a key priority for the Council as achieved across the East and West banks of the river to the south of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.1 Site Name</th>
<th>Representation Text: jspayne ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.2 Location</th>
<th>Representation Text: Enterprise House, Herbert Road. Newport NP19 7BH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.3 Grid Reference</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Response: 331737 189196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.4 Site Area</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Response: 0.35ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.5 Brief Description</th>
<th>Representation Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.6 Current Use</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Site: 123/ Enterprise House Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2060.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>W P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for residential development on Enterprise House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- Residential

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- Yes. Employment use

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- Very poor and require extensive improvement, no intrusion likely

**Council Response:**
- Countryside Comments: No strategic landscape issues. SPG/masterplans will require landscape & countryside input on visual and landscape amenity, tree issues, biodiversity and public access etc.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- No.

**Council Response:**
- Trees with TPO potential

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- Significant potential for improvement of local area and clean up of site.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- No.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- No.

**Council Response:**
- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- No.
### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Reports available

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** Yes. As part of the overall development scheme for this area - Close to River Usk

**Council Response:** Zone C1

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Yes

**Council Response:**
- Yes, Herbet rd to Turnes St.
- Unsuitable for residential development.
- Narrow, no footways. Poor junction with Turnes st.
- Could be developed as part of 1521 C1 only if linked to Durham Road school residential (enabling) site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2060.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>W P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** The proposed development falls within the St. Julians Ward that has a shortfall in Informal Play of 3.13Ha and Equipped Play of 2.54Ha. Owing to the size and proximity of the site to the Glebelands Recreation Grounds and Turner Street Play Area means that a request for an off-site contribution to upgrade local facilities would be required.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**

**Council Response:** 550M.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**

**Council Response:** Good, 5-10 mins

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**

**Council Response:** Newport 1.6km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**

**Council Response:** City centre 1.7km

Caerleon rd district centre - 900m

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**

**Council Response:** Town centre site with good employment opportunities

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**

**Council Response:** The national cycle path is on the rivers edge, near the western edge of the proposed site On-site provision and infrastructure. Possible link into riverside cycle way.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
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Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2060.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

Candidate site for residential development on Enterprise House.

**Council Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 4.9</th>
<th>Open Space?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Formal and Equipped play space at Glebelands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.1</th>
<th>Schools?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. New School project is part of the overall scheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.2</th>
<th>Community Engagement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.3</th>
<th>Community Aspirations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Improving the local environment for residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.4</th>
<th>Loss of Recreational Facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.1</th>
<th>Infrastructure Proximity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.2</th>
<th>Neighbouring Development Issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.3</th>
<th>Infrastructure Capacity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No. believed to be the case but further reports will need to be undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Welsh Water Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sewerage
It is unlikely that there will be any objection to these proposed developments. However, formal comment will be reserved until details highlighting the likely housing density on these sites are available in order that we can comment appropriately.

Water supply
The water mains serving this area suffer from low pressure and therefore supplying the sites may not be possible without re-enforcement of off site infrastructure. We will be in a position to comment further upon provision of further details of the proposed developments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2060.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Enterprise House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: Surrounded by other developments and close to residential sites

Council Response: The site is within the settlement boundary

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

Representation Text: 

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

Representation Text: 

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2060.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development on Enterprise House

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. 1 to 3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** The site is currently allocated as a housing proposal within the settlement boundary

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. temporary extension to workshops
- **Council Response:** DEVELOPMENT OF DUAL CARRIAGeway DISTRIBUTOR ROAD BETWEEN PONT EBBW AND COLDRA ROUNdABOUTS 99/0694 01/02/2000 Granted

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
- **Representation Text:**

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.
### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:** It is recommended that the site does not go forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:

- **Flood Zone C1:**
- **May affect SPA; RAMSAR:**
- **Part of site is within SSSI; adjacent to SINC:**
- **Likely to lead to significant increase in traffic dependent on volume of residential provision proposed:** Recommend development only be permitted if can be proven that public transport can be improved to increased frequency to centres of employment and the railway station;
- **Within Archeologically Sensitive Area and Gwent Levels Historic Landscape Characterisation Area Trowbridge:** Trowbridge: *a very remote area of landscape* development likely to significantly affect the character of the area as would be a large increase in existing settlement size (especially cumulatively with Marshfield East allocation); and
- **Increased pollution from traffic (air and noise).**

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:** This site is within the greenbelt outside of the settlement boundary of Marshfield. The site is also in an area of C1 flood risk. Newport City Council has a duty to direct development away from such areas.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council's strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council's strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Site Area</td>
<td>2061.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Blacktown, Marshfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

Representation Text: 10.3 ha

**Council Response:** 12.61Ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

Representation Text: Level ground within built limits of the settlement suitable for rounding-off.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

Representation Text: Unused

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text: Housing and open space.

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text: No.

**Council Response:**

Welsh Government comment: Moderate probability of BMV land. Max grade likely 3a. Probably a mix of 3a and 3b. This supported by Pre Revision survey which found grades 3a and 3b on the site. Salwick soils. Moderate Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Representation Text: Level ground note widely visible from the greater public domain but close views from footpath crossing the site. Undeveloped area of scrub contained within the general extent of the built form of the settlement.

**Council Response:**

Countryside Comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2061.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Blacktown, Marshfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
TPO 06/86 Many large hedgerow trees and hedges situated within the SSSI. Small fields have many hedges and trees. TPO potential.

**Council Response:**
Could safeguard boundary hedgerows and trees that may be lost through alternative uses.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

**Representation Text:**
Could safeguard boundary hedgerows and trees that may be lost through alternative uses.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:**
Structural open space will be an integral part of the development to retain and enhance green spaces and corridors and the existing land drains that are a feature of the land.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:**
Designated as an Archaeologically Sensitive Area.

**Council Response:**
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Majority of area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Also on edge between solid geology and alluvium of the Levels. This area is a likely location of settlements of all periods. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:**
Predominantly scrubland.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:**
Zone C1 - protected by existing flood defence infrastructure.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:**
Land drain only.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:**
Land excluded form the SSSI at this location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2061.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Blacktown, Marshfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Listed building n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic park n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation area n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Access can be obtained from The Shires, Oakfield and from St Mellons Road to the south-east.</td>
<td>St Mellons Road. Oakfields - visibility at Marshfield Road. The shires- Good access at Marshfield Road. Mallards Reach. Good access out Marshfield road. Poor access onto St Mellons Road, 60mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By increasing public access to on-site provision of open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By locating development close to existing bus services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250m</td>
<td>Marshfield Road - 160m edge of site. St mellons Road - edge of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 services per day.</td>
<td>1-2 hr frequency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16/02/2012
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2061.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Blacktown, Marshfield

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Council Response:** Newport

**Representation Text:** 5 miles

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Council Response:** Marshfield Road Post Office and shop. 450m

**Representation Text:** 4 shops available within 1 mile.

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Council Response:** Within 400m.

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Council Response:** No footways on St Mellons Road. Links into adjacent development and onto Marshfield Road.

**Representation Text:** By its sustainable location and through design and layout measures.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Council Response:** PROW 399/4 Crosses site.

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Council Response:** Adjacent to open space at Mallards Reach, Marshfield and Marshfield Playing Fields

**Representation Text:** Within 50m.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Council Response:** Marshfield Primary <600m.

**Representation Text:** Willowbank Primary <1,200m.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Council Response:** No.

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Council Response:** By the provision of choice in housing opportunities, and increased access to open spaces.

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Representation Text: Immediately adjacent.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text: Yes.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately. Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

Representation Text: The site is a logical rounding off of the settlement to its existing built limits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2061.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Blacktown, Marshfield

**Council Response:** The site is adjacent to the village boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** It would remove pressure for more incongruous urban expansions into the countryside at other locations.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** No. Other owners notified

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** No. Option to purchase.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Development of this unconstrained site would be expected to commence with 1-3 years.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Countryside and Green Belt designations would require removal.

**Council Response:** The site is allocated as Green Belt and Countryside in the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 96/0061 06/01/1997 Refused (Appeal dismissed)

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2061.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Blacktown, Marshfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of maintaining the openness of the area between Marshfield and Cardiff is acknowledged. However, the site is an unused area of land surrounded on three sides by existing urban development. For these reasons it does not contribute significantly to the openness of the Green Belt, or to countryside interests generally. Its development would round-off the settlement to logical limits and existing physical boundaries.

It is necessary that the Green Belt designation be reviewed through this development plan as its justification at the UDP inquiry was founded on the adequacy of the housing provision that could be delivered on previously developed sites and the Eastern Expansion Area. That strategy has not delivered the required amount of housing and a review of all options is therefore required.

The land at Marshfield is readily available an accessible and capable of delivering a significant number of new housing to the community at a location that people wish to live and in a sustainable development.

Question: 9  
Map Included?

Representation Text: Yes.
## Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2062.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land at Gelli Bach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agent:** Harmers Limited

### Rep'n/Para/Policy 2062.C1

#### Site: 125/ Gelli Bach

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

**Question: SA Recommendation**

- Taken together the sites are likely to have a significant effect on the landscape and townscape as they pose a significant increase to the settlement.
- PROWs should be retained and enhanced.
- Sites should be surveyed for their potential for providing habitats for important species, and mitigation implemented where possible ahead of development. This is applicable to both brownfield and greenfield sites.
- Part of the site is adjacent to a main road which could lead to noise pollution effects on residents. Further, proximity to the road may exacerbate an increase in traffic which will necessarily increase from such as substantial increase in housing in an out of town location.
- SAM adjacent to site (2065.C1) - it should be ensured that the setting of the site is not negatively affected by development.
- The sites could include some employment/mix use development to encourage local employment and reduce the need to travel.
- Dedicated walking and cycling routes should be created and enhanced, especially to connect the settlement with centres of employment.

**Council Response:**

- This site is in Green Wedge outside the settlement boundary of Castleton and in the Wentlooge area of proposed Special Landscape.
- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.
- The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land at Gelli Bach

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** Castleton

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST 256830

**Council Response:** 325617 183067
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2062.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
- **Representation Text:** 2.0 ha
- **Council Response:** 2.02

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- **Representation Text:** Level paddock and field adjoining Gelli Bach with associated outbuildings.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text:** Agricultural

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text:** Residential

**Question: 2.8 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.1 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Welsh Government comment: Moderate probability of BMV. Pre revision survey (036-85) found subgrade 3a at this site. Moderate Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** The site comprises 2 flat fields in an edge of settlement location, which is largely surrounded by existing development and highways. There are 2 barns in the western part of the site. The site is not visually prominent and would be seen primarily in the context of existing building limits.
- **Council Response:** Countryside Comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** There are a number of hedgerows which may be protected under hedgerow regulations.
- **Council Response:** There are no TPOs on the site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2062.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development on land at Gelli Bach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> Hedgerows and trees could be retained through a sympathetic scheme of development, whereas these may be lost if the land was incorporated into a greater agricultural or equestrian use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> Yes. It presents an opportunity to improve the landscape and biodiversity qualities of the hedgerow adjacent to the footpath.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.16 Archaeology?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong> Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.2 Greenfield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.7 SSSI?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.8 Protected Species?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062.C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. There are a number of access options available. These include access onto a lane which adjoins the site's north-eastern limits and from the road which adjoins the southern site boundary. Both exit onto the Marshfield Road with good visibility in both directions and traffic calming improvements.

**Council Response:** No. Bakey Lane - Substandard width and access. Access to chucker factory, substandard width, no footways.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. On-site children’s play area and linkage to ROW network.

**Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in place space of 6.79Ha. Owing to the distance from the nearest play facilities, approximately 2Km, a LEAP would need to be provided to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development with off-site contributions being made towards formal play provision locally.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. By good proximity.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** <50m. (A48 = 450m)

**Council Response:** Marshfield Road - 30m edge of site. A48 -500m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** 8 services per day. (3 times hourly along the A48)

**Council Response:** 1-2 Hr frequency - Marshfield Road. 10-20min - A48

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:** 5 miles

**Council Response:** Newport - 9km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd  Late?</th>
<th>Source Type Mode</th>
<th>Status Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2062.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009 P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land at Gelli Bach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
- <1,000m

**Council Response:**
Marshfield road - Post Officer and Store

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**
- Being at a location with walking distance of local services and cycling distance of jobs.

**Council Response:**
- No footways or access lanes.
- No link to public highway.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes.

**Council Response:**
- A footpath crosses the southern field; this is shown on the site plan. This would either be retained or diverted as part of the development scheme.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:**
- 150m.

**Council Response:**
- None in close proximity.

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes.
- Marshfield Primary <150m.
- Public House <600m.
- Garden Centre <600m.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**
- No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**
- By providing housing opportunities at places where people wish to live.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**
- No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:**
- Adjacent.
Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
   Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
   Representation Text: Yes.
   Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

   Sewerage
   From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

   Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply
It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment
No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
   Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
   Representation Text: The site relates well to existing development and is largely surrounded by existing development.
   Council Response: The site is adjacent to settlement boundary

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
   Representation Text: It would help to reduce the pressure for more incongruous urban extensions elsewhere in Newport.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2062.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for residential development on land at Gelli Bach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
Representation Text: No. Owners of southern field to be notified.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
Representation Text: Yes. Proposer is owner of northern field.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
Representation Text: Yes. Within years 1-3 of the LDP.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
Representation Text: Yes. Would require the removal of countryside and green wedge designations.
Council Response: The site is allocated as Green Wedge and Countryside.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 94/0341 10/06/1994 Refused (no appeal)

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
Representation Text: The site relates well to and comprises a logical extension of Castleton which is largely surrounded by existing development.

Castleton and nearby Marshfield accommodate a range of services and facilities which would be accessible by walking and cycling. A bus route runs through the village and additional services run along Newport Road.

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2062.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land at Gelli Bach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a range of employment opportunities within reasonable proximity of the site, some locally in Castleton and Marshfield and a wider range on the fringes of St Mellons; some of these would be accessible on foot or by cycle.

The allocation of this site for housing would comprise a logical and sustainable development in a locality which offers a range of local services, facilities and employment opportunities and is well served by public transport. The allocation of the site would also contribute to the range and choice of housing opportunities available in Newport in a location where people want to live.

Question: 9 Map Included?
Map Included? Yes.
### Summary

Candidate site for retail allocation/retention within Newport Retail Park district centre

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:**

- Matalan and Dutton Foreshaw at Newport Retail Park

---

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:**

- Seven Stiles Avenue, Newport Retail Park, Newport

---

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:**

- Easting: 334814, Northing: 186922

**Council Response:**

- 325617 183067

---

### Question: 2.4 Site Area

**Representation Text:**

- 2.9ha

**Council Response:**

- 2.02ha

---

### Question: 2.5 Brief Description

- 

---

### Question: 2.6 Current Use

**Representation Text:**

- Retail units / vacant

---

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)

**Representation Text:**

- Retail allocation / retention within Newport Retail Park district centre

---

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?

**Representation Text:**

- Yes. Retail units.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2063.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for retail allocation/retention within Newport Retail Park district centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representation Text:** No Strategic Landscape issues
- **Council Response:** Part of allocated / established district centre. The site possesses a character typical of retail park.

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

- **Representation Text:** Limited tree value.
- **Council Response:** No.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: In Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2063.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for retail allocation/retention within Newport Retail Park district centre

---

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** The site is within C1 flood zone

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. There is an established highway network in place.
- **Council Response:** Yes-transport assessment required

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
- **Representation Text:** N/A

The proposed development falls within the Lliswerry Ward that has a shortfall in Informal Play of 2.24Ha and Equipped Play of 2.94Ha. Should residential development be proposed on this site, its isolated position and size would require on-site provision of a range of play facilities to meet the immediate needs of the young people on the development, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
- **Representation Text:** N/A

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
- **Representation Text:** 200m
- **Council Response:** 100 metres
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2063.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for retail allocation/retention within Newport Retail Park district centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

- **Representation Text:** Bus number 20 and 42 - up to 6 buses per hour (Mon-Sat)
- **Council Response:** 30 mins-1hour service

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

- **Representation Text:** 3.8 miles (Newport Central)
- **Council Response:** Newport station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A
- **Council Response:** Tesco 150 metres

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A
- **Council Response:** On site provision to link to Queensway cycle way

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A
- **Council Response:** The closest open space is a formal space at Llanwern Steelworks Sports Ground

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2063.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for retail allocation/retention within Newport Retail Park district centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
Representation Text: Existing units connected to services.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**
Representation Text: Yes.
Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

- **Sewerage**
  
  From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

  Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

- **Water Supply**
  
  It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. Any upgrade of this asset will likely be considerably expensive. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**
Representation Text: N/A
Council Response: The site is within the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
Representation Text: N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2063.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** N/A

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Council Response:** The site is partly white land and partly a retail allocation within the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

** Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**

- SITING OF FLOODLIT OPEN MARKET WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING
  89/0850  09/02/1990  Refused
  No computer records

- SITING OF FLOODLIT OPEN MARKET WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING (DUPLICATE APPLICATION)
  08/0851  09/02/1990  Refused
  No computer records

- ERECTION OF TWO SHOWROOMS WITH ASSOCIATED CANOPIES WITH VEHICLE SALES AND DISPLAY SALE AND PROVISION OF ANCILLARY COMPATIBLE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES AND PRE-DELIVERY INSPECTION BUILDING AND CAR WASH FACILITIES
  96/0923  18/11/2009  Withdrawn
  No computer records

- USE OF LAND AND ERECTION OF BUILDING FOR SALE OF MOTOR VEHICLES AND ANCILLARY GOODS TOGETHER WITH OFFICES AND PARKING PROVISION
  97/0131  19/03/1997  Granted with conditions
  No computer records
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2063.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for retail allocation/retention within Newport Retail Park district centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ERECTION OF CAR SHOWROOM WITH ANCILLARY WORKSHOP, OPEN AIR DISPLAY AREAS AND CAR PARKING**

99/1290 08/03/2000 Granted with conditions

Welsh Water: Response awaited.

Swalec: No objections.

Transco: High pressure gas main adjoins the site.

Environment Agency: Request the imposition of conditions requiring that all oils, fuels and chemicals be stored in impervious bunds and that all surface water to pass through an oil interceptor before discharge.

Caldicot And Wentloog Levels Drainage Board: No land drainage objections subject to compliance with Land Drainage Bylaws.

Head Of Public Protection: No objections.

Head Of Engineering And Transportation: Requires the provision of footpaths with the site for pedestrians and the provision of 7 disabled parking spaces. Also require that effluent from the car wash is discharged to the foul sewer.

**SITING OF FLOODLIT OPEN MARKET WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING - RESUBMISSION FOLLOWING REFUSAL OF 89/0850/F**

90/0426 08/06/1990 Granted with conditions

No computer record

**DEVELOPMENT OF RETAIL WAREHOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING**

00/0303 15/05/2000 Withdrawn

No computer record – application withdrawn prior to preparation of report

**RETAIL WAREHOUSE (3828m OF A1 NON FOOD RETAIL) AND ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING (UNIT 3)**

00/0532 19/07/2000 Granted with conditions

Head Of Engineering And Transportation: No objection to revised scheme.

Head Of Economic Development And Regeneration: No objection.

Head Of Public Protection: No objection.

Welsh Water: No objection.

Transco: No objection.

Environment Agency: No objections but request that planning conditions be imposed on any approval relating to installation of an oil interceptor and surface water regulation.

Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological SOCIETY: No Objections.

SWALEC: No objection.

Caldicot And Wentloog Levels Drainage Board: No objection subject to conditions relating to drainage.

**DEVELOPMENT OF HEALTH AND FITNESS CENTRE WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING**

00/0567 20/02/2001 Withdrawn

Head Of Engineering And Transportation: no objection.

Head Of Economic Development And Regeneration: express concerns for the impact of the out of centre leisure development on the grounds that such development would be more appropriately sited on a town centre site and cumulatively could adversely affect the centre.

Head Of Public Protection: no objection.

Environment Agency: no objection subject to conditions requiring the installation of an oil interceptor and surface water regulation.

Welsh Water: no objection.

Caldicot And Wentloog Levels Drainage Board: no objection subject to drainage related conditions.

British Gas Transco: no objection.

South Wales Electricity: no objection.

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust: no objection.

**ERECTION OF RETAIL WAREHOUSING AND ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING**
**Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed**

- **by:** Representation No
- **Filtered to show:** (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

| Rep’n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodged Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------------------|
| **2063.C1**                     | 06/05/2009 | P | P | W | M | | | Candidate site for retail allocation/retention within Newport Retail Park district centre |

**Summary:**

01/0291 09/05/2001 Refused

- **HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION:** Expresses concern that the service vehicle turning area for Unit 2 encroaches into the public car park which is not ideal and the spaces should be designated for staff and not public use. The minimum number of disabled parking spaces should be 15 and not 10.

- **ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:** No objection subject to conditions regarding the storage of oils/fuels/chemicals and surface water drainage.

- **HEAD OF LEGAL AND STANDARDS:** No response.

- **DWR CYMRU - WELSH WATER:** No objection.

- **CALDICOT AND WENTLOOG LEVELS DRAINAGE BOARD:** No objection subject to full details of surface water drainage being submitted and a maintenance strip being provided alongside the Longditch Reen.

- **BRITISH GAS TRANSCO:** No objection.

- **SOUTH WESTERN ELECTRICITY:** Identify apparatus in the area.

- **GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST:** No objection.

- **NEWPORT LARGE TRADERS:** No response.

**DEVELOPMENT OF 2 RETAIL UNITS (3,840m2), CAR PARKING, SERVICING AND LANDSCAPING (RESUBMISSION)**

01/0915 05/03/2002 Granted with conditions

- **Forsshaw, Newport Retail Park:** no response.

- **HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION:** Expresses concern that the service vehicle turning area for Unit 2 encroaches into the public car park which is not ideal and the spaces should be designated for staff and not public use. The minimum number of disabled parking spaces should be 10 and not 9.

- **ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:** No response.

- **HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES:** No objection.

- **HEAD OF LAW AND STANDARDS:** Confirms the submitted unilateral undertaking is acceptable.

- **DWR CYMRU - WELSH WATER:** No objection.

- **CALDICOT AND WENTLOOG LEVELS DRAINAGE BOARD:** No objection subject to full details of surface water drainage being submitted and a maintenance strip being provided alongside the Longditch Reen.

- **BRITISH GAS TRANSCO:** Confirm a low pressure main runs through the site.

- **WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION:** Identify apparatus in the area.

- **GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST:** No objection.

- **NEWPORT LARGE TRADERS:** No response.

- **COUNCILLORS BUCKLOW, CRITCHLEY AND**

---

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:**

- **Yes. 02/0302 - Variation of Condition 4 (type of goods) of planning permission 01/0915 to allow for the sale of clothing, footwear, toys and books.**

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:**

- **No.**

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**

- **Submitted as cover letter:**

  **Dear Sir / Madam**

  Newport Retail Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2063.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for retail allocation/retention within Newport Retail Park district centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Development Plan (LDP) Candidate Site Representation

Savills have been instructed by AXA Real Estate Investment Managers to promote their site at Newport Retail Park as a Candidate Site for consideration as part of the forthcoming LDP. The completed Candidate Site forms and a site location plan (scale 1:3000) are enclosed.

As you will be aware, Newport Retail Park is allocated within the adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as a district centre and our client’s site is located within the boundary of this district centre. It consists of two retail units - Matalan and Dutton Forshaw, and the undeveloped area in between. This vacant space is also allocated specifically for retail use in the adopted UDP.

The suitability of Newport Retail Park to be allocated as a district centre and of our clients’ site, to form an integral part of it, has already previously been considered through the UDP process, associated Public Inquiry, and was formally endorsed by the appointed Inspector as part of this process.

The Inspectors Report makes reference to the need for this district centre to support the Eastern Expansion Area. It is noted that they considered Newport Retail Park offers a wide range of goods and services that would be available to the future inhabitants of the Eastern Expansion Area. This was considered an overriding advantage in favour of this allocation. As development of the Eastern Expansion Area is expected to commence during the LDP plan period, it will be necessary to ensure that the shopping needs of the increase in population in this area can be met.

Considering the existing allocation of the district centre, of which this site is an integral part, and the existing position within the district centre, we advocate that the district centre as currently designated, and the status of the vacant site is maintained, will be ‘rolled forward’ for inclusion within the LDP for the relevant uses -as a ‘refreshed’ allocation. We look forward to your confirmation that the site will accordingly be considered as part of the emerging LDP in due course.

If you require anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely
Jon Hurley
Associate

Enc Site Location Plan and Candidate Site Representation Form

Question: 9 Map Included?

Representation Text: Yes.
## 2.1 Site Name
**Representation Text:** The Old Rectory and Gardens, Bishton

## 2.2 Location
**Representation Text:** Bishton, Newport, NP18 2DZ

## 2.3 Grid Reference
**Representation Text:** ST 3887

## 2.4 Site Area
**Representation Text:** 1.42 hectares

## 2.5 Brief Description
**Representation Text:** The site accommodates an existing house and gardens. The gardens comprise slightly sloping grassed area with some trees.

---

The site is in the countryside adjoining the settlement boundary of Bishton Village. It is also an area of High landscape value and adjacent to a C2 flood risk area.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development. Given the location it is not considered this would be a logical or necessary extension of the boundary.
## Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2064.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on The Old Rectory and Gardens, Bishton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question: 2.6 Current Use
**Representation Text:** Residential and garden

### Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)
**Representation Text:** Residential development including affordable housing

### Question: 3.1 Brownfield?
**Representation Text:** Yes/No
- Residential and associated garden
- **Council Response:** No

### Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?
**Representation Text:** No

### Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?
**Representation Text:** No

### Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?
**Representation Text:** The local landscape comprises flat/gently sloping grazing land and the proposed development would not be highly visible or intrusive within it.

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?
**Representation Text:** There are some mature trees which would be retained within the development scheme. Additional planting could be carried out to replace any losses.

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
**Representation Text:** Trees to be retained and new planting carried out as appropriate.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
**Representation Text:** No. This is an edge of village site but trees are to be retained within gardens and open space to be provided which would facilitate wildlife corridors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2064.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for residential development on The Old Rectory and Gardens, Bishton

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:**
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Site of Tump Farm a post-medieval farm that is likely to have had a medieval precursor. Also possibility of medieval settlement associated with church. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes/No Residential and associated garden

**Council Response:**

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:**
No. TAN 15 Maps show that this site is not affected by flooding.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:**
None known

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:**
None known

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Additional traffic generated would be insignificant.

**Council Response:**
yes via private lane
Consulting junction substandard in terms of visibility splay. Additional turning movements not acceptable.

Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
Representation Text: Open space to be provided as part of scheme.
Council Response: The Llanwern Ward has a shortfall in play space of 1.52Ha. The nearest play facilities are approximately 800m away. Owing to the small size of the site an off-site contributions for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
 representation Text: Proposed development accessible to and could help support local transport services.

Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
Representation Text: Within 10-15 metres
Council Response: 50 metres

Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
Representation Text: 1 per hour
Council Response: 1-2 hour frequency

Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
Representation Text: Approx 8 kilometres to Newport City
Council Response: Newport station

Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
Representation Text: Shops are available in Newport, the outskirts of which are approximately 4 kilometres away.
Council Response: ringland district centre 4.2km
underwood district centre 2.9km
magor square 5km

Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
Representation Text: The site is very close to the Eastern Expansion Area and is reasonably accessible to local jobs and services.

Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
Representation Text: There is a range of local services, facilities and job opportunities accessible by walking and cycling.
Council Response: on site provision
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2064.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development on The Old Rectory and Gardens, Bishton

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** 388/19 OUTSIDE SITE, ALONG THE BOUNDARY

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?

**Representation Text:** Within 1.5 kilometres

**Council Response:** Open space is located at Bishton Playing Fields

### Question: 5.1 Schools?

**Representation Text:** Yes. There is a public house and a church in Bishton and reasonable access exists to other facilities in the locality.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

**Representation Text:** Not aware of any discussions

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

**Representation Text:** The development of the site would allow for the provision of public open space and provide choice in housing opportunities.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

**Representation Text:** All of the services are in close proximity to this site.

### Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Sufficient infrastructure is in place.

**Council Response:** Welsh Water Comments

---

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off
Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

We have been consulted with respect to the Llanwern Village and the Llanwern Steelworks developments and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to each of these developments and we are working with your council to ensure that appropriate conditions be included within any planning consents.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our trunk mains could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A report has been undertaken to highlight the required works to supply the Llanwern Village and Llanwern Steelwork’s developments. It is likely that further works will be required to extend these required works to supply any other proposed development within the Llanwern catchment.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer an the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

*Representation Text:*
No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

*Representation Text:*
- The site adjoins existing built up limits, there is a church located to the west and there is an existing residential property in the northern part of this site. The scheme would provide a link between the church and house and main part of village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2064.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on The Old Rectory and Gardens, Bishton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

The site is in close proximity to the village boundary

---

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

Representation Text: It would remove pressure from other sites which are not as well related.

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

Representation Text: Yes. 1-3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

Representation Text: Yes. The settlement boundary would need to be amended to include the site and the site would need to be deleted from the countryside designation.

**Council Response:**

The site is currently allocated as Countryside.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

Representation Text: None

**Council Response:**

- REBUILDING OF STABLES AND CONVERSION TO GARAGES AND STOREROOM
  - 92/0857 26/09/1992 Agricultural Determination
  - No computer record
- CHANGE OF USE TO RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME AND CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO RESIDENTIAL ANNEX
  - 05/0864 19/07/2005 Withdrawn
  - Bishton Community Council
  - Head Of Engineering & Construction
  - Social Services-Adult
  - Countryside Team
  - Dwr Cymru - Welsh Water
  - NOTE – No consultee response listed on computer
| Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------|-------|-----------------------------|
| 2064.C1                                                       | 06/05/2009    | Y              | P      | P     | W             | M               | Summary: Candidate site for residential development on The Old Rectory and Gardens, Bishton |

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** None known

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** Unknown

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**
- The candidate site at The Old Rectory, Bishton, is located at the southern limits of the village, close to the Newport urban boundary. The site has reasonable access to the existing services and facilities, in Bishton, Underwood, on the eastern fringes of Newport 3-4 kilometres away and in the general locality. The site also has good accessibility to existing and proposed employment opportunities many of which would be accessible by walking or cycling. The site is located approximately 0.7 kilometres from the Eastern Expansion Area where a range of new services, facilities and employment opportunities will be provided. The development of the site as proposed would help sustain local services and facilities.

- The village is currently served by a local bus service and new routes will be introduced as part of the Eastern Area Expansion, the closest part of which is approximately 0.7 kilometres from the site.

- The site relates well to existing development, it accommodates the Old Rectory in the northern part of the site, St Cadwaladr’s Church is located to the west and the southern limits of the site is in close proximity to the built up limits of Bishton. The development of the site as proposed would link the church and existing house with the main part of the village and consolidate village form.

- The site is unconstrained and could be made available for development in the early part of the LDP period. The allocation of this site would help meet housing needs in this part of the County.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.
### Site: 128/ Land adjoining Wentloog House

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
<td><strong>SA Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>☒ Taken together the sites are likely to have a significant effect on the landscape and townscape as the pose a significant increase to the settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒ PROWs should be retained and enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒ Sites should be surveyed for their potential for providing habitats for important species, and mitigation implemented where possible ahead of development. This is applicable to both brownfield and greenfield sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒ Part of site is adjacent to a main road which could lead to noise pollution effects on residents. Further, proximity to the road may exacerbate an increase in traffic which will necessarily increase from such as substantial increase in housing in an out of town location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒ SAM adjacent to site (2065.C1) - it should be ensured that the setting of the site is not negatively affected by development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒ The sites could include some employment/mix use development to encourage local employment and reduce the need to travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒ Dedicated walking and cycling routes should be created and enhanced, especially to connect the settlement with centres of employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Overall Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>This site is the green belt outside the settlement of Castleton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.1</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Land adjoining Wentloog House, Castleton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.2</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The candidate site is located in Castleton, Newport and lies between the A48 and the A48M, to the east of Coal Pit Lane and west of Wentloog Rise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.3</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>32515 18345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>325067 183398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2065.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

| Representation Text | 1.774 ha |

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

| Representation Text | The site slopes gently to the A48, which forms the southern boundary. The site is featureless and used for grazing. There is built development to the north, east and south and Coal Pit Lane to the west. |

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

| Representation Text | Grazing |

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

| Representation Text | Residential development |

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

| Representation Text | No. |

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

| Representation Text | No. |

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

| Representation Text | Yes. The site is used for horse grazing. It is identified as land in urban use on the Provisional Agricultural Land Classification map (Sheet 154). |

**Council Response:**

Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. Low probability of BMV at this site. The site is flat and the climate favourable but the relatively high FCD (218) coupled with the soil type mean the land is unlikely to grade better than 3a. This is further supported by a pre revision survey that covered this parcel of land and found it to be subgrade 3a.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

| Representation Text | The site is not designated for its landscape value and has little or no intrinsic landscape interest. It is contained by landform and hedgerows and overlooked by residential development, especially the new houses at Wentloog Rise and those under construction north of Wentloog House. The site is not prominent in distant or medium views. |

**Council Response:**

Countryside Comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

| Representation Text | Yes. Three are three TPO trees on the northern site boundary (T1 37, T1 38, T1 39), but their retention would not preclude or limit development on the site. |

**Council Response:**

TPO GWT/104 Horse Ches & Oak. Trees protected by TPO Gwent 104.
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### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?
**Rep'n Text:** The site is currently heavily grazed and puddled by horses. Development for family housing, with gardens, would enhance biodiversity.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?
**Rep'n Text:** No. The layout of the site could ensure connections to the existing public rights of way network in the locality.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?
**Rep'n Text:** Yes. Wentloog Castle (Mound), which is a scheduled ancient monument, adjoins the site. Development on the site would have no direct effect and the monument’s setting could be preserved in the layout of the site.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Adjacent to Wentloog Castle a scheduled ancient monument. Restraint. Archaeological evaluation carried out. Archaeological features located but not of sufficient importance to preclude development subject to conditions. The area could be allocated in LDP subject to conditions and with proviso that the impact on the setting of the scheduled monument could restrict development.

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?
**Rep'n Text:** Yes.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?
**Rep'n Text:** No.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?
**Rep'n Text:** No. The site lies within Zone A on the TAN 15 development advice map and, therefore, is not at risk of flooding.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?
**Rep'n Text:** No.

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?
**Rep'n Text:** No. There are no physical constraints to developing this site.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?
**Rep'n Text:** No.

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?
**Rep'n Text:** No. None so far as we are aware.

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

### Representations & Council Responses Juxtaposed

#### Newport City Council Local Development Plan
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**Representations & Council Responses:**

**Council Response:**

- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments (yes, adjacent to site)
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Development on the site could be accessed from Coal Pit Lane, part of which would require to be widened within the site. Adjacent to the site, Coal Pit Lane connects with the A48 which at this point is dual carriageway. There would be no traffic generation issues.

**Council Response:**

- Yes - A48 + coal pit lane/
- Access onto A48 not acceptable.
- Access onto coal pit lane.
- Visibility requirement to be proved by speed survey and transport statement.
- Local improvement probably be required.
- Poor footways on a48

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. Owing to the distance from the nearest play facilities, approximately 2.7Km, it is proposed that a LEAP would need to be provided to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development.

**Council Response:**

See answers to Qs 4.7 and 4.9.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** Bus stops are already within easy reach of the site. Development on the site would help support local bus services.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** There are three bus stops within easy reach of the site: two on the A48 east of the site and one off Marshfield road.

**Council Response:** a48 adjacent to site frontage.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** Three services run from these bus stops: Service 30 every 30 minutes (Newport, St Mellons, Rumney and Cardiff); Service 31A every 3 hours (Newport, Castleton, Marshfield); Service X16 every 2 hours (Cardiff, Risca, Newbridge, Abertillery)

**Council Response:** 10-20 min frequency

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:** Newport train station is approximately 8 miles away.
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**Council Response:** Newport central

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** There is a 24 hour garage with shop opposite the site. There is another convenience store and post office in Marshfield (about 1 mile away).
- **Council Response:**
  - Garage on A48 at 50 m
  - School 700m
  - Shop and Post Office 2km

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:**
  - The site is located between Newport and Cardiff and with good access to each by public as well as private transport.

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:**
  - The site is adjacent to an extensive network of public rights of way, which give easy access to the surrounding countryside.
- **Council Response:** Local infrastructure improvements as on site facilities

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. A public right of way runs outside of the western boundary of the site.

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?
- **Representation Text:**
  - Residential development on the site would incorporate a children's play area; this would be of benefit to other residents of Castleton as well as site residents. Tredegar Park is within easy travelling distance.
- **Council Response:**
  - There are no formal, informal or equipped open space in the proximity to the site

### Question: 5.1 Schools?
- **Representation Text:**
  - Marshfield Junior and Infant School.
- **Council Response:** Yes.

### Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
- **Representation Text:** Development on the site would help meet the demand for new homes in an attractive and accessible location.

### Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

- **Representation Text:**

16/02/2012
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2065.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land adjoining Wentloog House, Castleton

Representation Text: The site adjoins extensive new development and all utilities (including gas and mains sewerage) are available

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
Representation Text: No. The proposed development for housing would be entirely compatible with adjacent uses, which are also residential.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
Representation Text: Yes. The site adjoins existing residential development and it is believed that sufficient capacity exists to cater for residential development on the site.

Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
Representation Text: The site adjoins both existing residential development and the existing UDP settlement boundary for Castleton. The site is visually contained and overlooked by existing houses.

Council Response: The site is adjacent to the village boundary

Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
Candidate site for residential development on land adjoining Wentloog House, Castleton. The site is enclosed by existing built development and roads. Development on the site would not set a precedent for the release of other greenfield sites on the western edge of Castleton as those sites lie within the Green Belt.

Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
Representation Text: Yes.

Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
Representation Text: No. Acting on behalf of the owners.

Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
Representation Text: Yes. Wentloog House, adjoining the site, is in the same ownership and is identified in blue on the candidate site map.

Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?
Representation Text: Yes. The site is not subject to any legal or physical constraints and is available for immediate (or phased) development.

Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?
Representation Text: Yes. The settlement and green wedge boundaries would need to be adjusted. The purpose for which the green wedge was designated would not be materially affected. The site lies outside the Green Belt.

Council Response: The site is allocated as Countryside and Green Wedge and is adjacent to the green belt.

Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
Representation Text: No.

Council Response:
- ERECTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING (OUTLINE) 90/1155 07/12/1990 refused No computer record
- CONSTRUCTION OF NEW RECERTION AREA HEALTH SUITE CONSERVATORY AND OTHER ASSOCIATED BUILDINGS 91/0374 05/07/1991 Granted with conditions No computer record
- APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS RELATING TO 90/1155/O - SITING DESIGN EXTERNAL APPEARANCE MEANS OF ACCESS AND LANDSCAPING 93/0731 24/09/1993 Approved No computer record
- ERECTION OF HOTEL WITH CONFERENCE FACILITIES AND ASSOCIATED INN / RESTAURANT CAR PARKING ACCESS ROAD AND LANDSCAPE WORKS

16/02/2012
ERECTED OF ONE DETACHED DWELLING
07/0161 19/04/2007 Granted with conditions
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: No objection subject to the applicant being able to provide the minimum driveway width for a shared access of 4.1m.
GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST LTD: Due to previous archaeological evaluation within the nearby area it is considered that the archaeological resource in the application area is unlikely to be of sufficient importance for the current development to be refused. However, it is recommended that a condition be applied to any grant of planning permission requiring the applicant to appoint a suitably qualified archaeologist to undertake an archaeological watching brief during the ground disturbing work.
CADW: The above application does not have a direct effect upon the scheduled area of Wentloog Castle (MM131). Cadw considers that this proposal will have a minimal or nil effect upon the setting of the monument. Cadw therefore does not raise any concerns regarding this application.

ERECTED OF 2 DETACHED DWELLINGS (OUTLINE)
07/0651 04/10/2007 Granted with conditions
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: No objection subject to satisfactory parking, visibility splays; gates to open inwards and set back a minimum of 5.5m and the access to be hard paved a minimum of 5.5m from the highway.
GWENT GLAMORGAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: A condition should be attached ensuring that an archaeological watching brief is conducted.
CADW: Has no concerns regarding the impact of the development on the scheduled monument of the motte of Wentlooge Castle.

08/0032 15/02/2008 Withdrawn
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: Would not oppose the application subject to the following conditions:
- the driveway shall be hard paved for a distance of 5m from the highway boundary;
- walls/fences along the highway boundary shall not exceed 900mm in height to maintain adequate visibility at the driveway accesses;
- no surface water shall drain from the property onto the highway, details to be provided;
- an environmental risk assessment should be undertaken by the Authority.
WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION: Details of apparatus.
WALES AND WEST UTILITIES: Details of apparatus.
WELSH WATER – DWR CYMRU: No response

ERECTED OF 3 NO. DETACHED HOUSES (RESUBMISSION FOLLOWING WITHDRAWAL OF 08/0032)
08/0388 22/05/2008 Granted with conditions
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: The applicant must demonstrate a visibility splay of 2.4m x 45m is achievable at the site access into Mill Lane, boundary walls/fences or planting within the visibility splays must not exceed a height of 900mm. Three parking spaces and turning area must be provided for each property. The driveway must also be hard paved for a distance of 5m from the edge of the highway.
DWR CYMRU-WELSH WATER: Request conditions relating to foul and surface water drainage.
WALES AND WEST UTILITIES: Has no apparatus in the area. Information regarding possible privately owned apparatus and that owned by other utility companies should be obtained by the owners. Safe digging practices in accordance with HS(G)47, must be used.
WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION: Details of apparatus.

ERECTED OF A NEW DWELLING HOUSE
08/0982 09/10/2008 Granted with conditions
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: No objection subject to the garage being increased to 6m in length and the shared access must have a minimum width of 4.1m along its entire length and be hard paved.
HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (HEALTH): No objection.
WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION: Advise of equipment in the area.
DWR CYMRU – WELSH WATER: Foul water and surface water must be discharged separately from the site. No surface water or land drainage run off shall be allowed to connect to the
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GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST LTD: Advise that an archaeologist be on site during ground works to conduct a watching brief. Suggest a condition.
MARSHFIELD COMMUNITY COUNCIL: No objections as long as the proposed dwelling does not fall outside the village boundary.

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 9 Map Included?
Representation Text: Yes.
### Question: SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**
- Taken together the sites are likely to have a significant effect on the landscape and townscape as the pose a significant increase to the settlement.
- PROWs should be retained and enhanced.
- Sites should be surveyed for their potential for providing habitats for important species, and mitigation implemented where possible ahead of development. This is applicable to both brownfield and greenfield sites.
- Part of site is adjacent to a main road which could lead to noise pollution effects on residents. Further, proximity to the road may exacerbate an increase in traffic which will necessarily increase from such as substantial increase in housing in an out of town location.
- SAM adjacent to site (2065.C1) - it should be ensured that the setting of the site is not negatively affected by development.
- The sites could include some employment/mix use development to encourage local employment and reduce the need to travel.
- Dedicated walking and cycling routes should be created and enhanced, especially to connect the settlement with centres of employment.

### Question: Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**
- This site is in green wedge outside the settlement of Castleton.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

**Representation Text:** Poultry Packing Plant

### Question: 2.2 Location

**Representation Text:** 30B Marshfield Road, Castleton, Newport, CF3 2UW

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

**Representation Text:** ST257832

**Council Response:** 325674 183177
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**Summary:** Candidate site for residential use on Poultry Packing Plant, 30B Marshfield Road

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
- **Representation Text:** 0.95 hectares
- **Council Response:** 0.57Ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- **Representation Text:** The site is accessed by a private driveway from Marshfield Road; it houses light industrial steel frame buildings clad in profile metal sheeting surrounded by concrete hard standing.

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text:** Poultry Packing Plant
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text:** Residential
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 2.8 Site Area**
- **Representation Text:**
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. We understand that the current light industrial buildings on site were built in the 1980's. The property has been used as a Halal chicken processing factory.
- **Council Response:** The site is predominantly brownfield

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No. We believe that the site is classified as light industrial (rather than agricultural use) but we would be grateful if the council could confirm this.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** The site is behind several residential houses (to the east of Marshfield Road) which largely conceal the site from the road. The site has good views to the south and east. We believe the replacement of the existing industrial units with new houses would be hugely beneficial to the local environment and in keeping with the adjacent buildings.
- **Council Response:** Countryside Comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** No TPOs for this site. Hedgerows.
### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:** At present the site is almost entirely concreted over providing very little biodiversity. Residential development would allow an opportunity to re-landscape the site and plant new trees. Should our application be viewed favourably we would be happy to provide landscape proposals for approval.

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Please refer to 3.14, 4.7 & 4.8

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:** Not known. We have sent details to the Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust and are awaiting their response.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:** No. See Above

**Council Response:** The site is predominantly brownfield

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** No. We are not aware of any contamination on site. A soil test of the site has been commissioned and should be available in June of 2009.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** No. According to the environment agency's online map, the site is outside the tidal flood area.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** Yes. There is a small stream that runs parallel to the northwest site boundary (refer to the enclosed site plan)

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No. The site has previously been levelled; presumably when the current units on site were built.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:** No.
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**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. The site is accessible from the public highway along a private driveway from Marshfield Road. It is anticipated that this driveway would need to be upgraded should the application be successful. We would be happy to take advice from the council’s highways department as to their specific requirements. If maintained, the current industrial use is likely to require large lorry deliveries on a regular basis.

**Council Response:**

No Private track leading to Marshfield Road.
No footways, substandard width
Good visibility at junction

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. Owing to the small size of the site an off-site contributions for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

**Council Response:**

See 4.7

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:** See 4.1

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:** There are bus routes along Marshfield Road (bus stops approx 200m from the site).

**Council Response:**

Marshfield road- 150m
A48- 580m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:** There are buses to Newport (31c &31A) seven times a day and buses to Cardiff (X16) six times a day (Monday to Friday).

**Council Response:**

Marshfield rd. 1-2hr frequency
A48 -10-20 min frequency

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:** The nearest railway station is in Llanishen (approx 4 miles as the crow flies)

**Council Response:**

Newport 9km
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**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

*Representation Text:* There is a petrol station with a convenience shop on the A48; this is approximately 1/2 km from the site.

*Council Response:* Marshfield Road. Post Office and shop 1.6km A48- garage-830m

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

*Representation Text:* The site is very well located (approximately half way between Newport and Cardiff) close to the A48 and only about 200m off the main road through Castleton.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

*Representation Text:* In re-landscaping the site there is an opportunity to improve the footpath adjacent to the northwest boundary of the site. Cycle stores would be provided.

*Council Response:* No footways ib access track. Flyways on Marshfield Road.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

*Representation Text:* There is a footpath that runs parallel to the northwest boundary of the site (please refer to the enclosed site plan).

*Council Response:* PROW 399/3 at northern boundary of site. PROW FP 399/32 Has been obstructed, and still is obstructed for some time. The residential development of the site would be an opportunity to clear away current obstructions and properly establish the correct legal route of the Public Way

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

*Representation Text:* The footpath adjacent to the site leads to open countryside to the east and links up to several other paths.

*Council Response:* There is no open space in proximity of the site

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

*Representation Text:* Marshfield Primary School is approximately 300m from the site (south along Marshfield road).

*Council Response:* Yes

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

*Representation Text:* No

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

*Representation Text:* In our view the current units are out of scale and unsightly in a village location. This is an opportunity to replace them with houses that would be more in keeping with the location.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

*Representation Text:* No

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

16/02/2012
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2070.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential use on Poultry Packing Plant, 30B Marshfield Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. See also 3.1. The proposed residential use is likely to greatly reduce the levels of noise, traffic and smell that has been generated on the site by the poultry packing plant.

**Council Response:**

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. See 6.1

**Welsh Water Comments**

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:**
New houses have recently been built along the road between the site and Marshfield road; the development of the site seems a natural extension of this.

**Council Response:**
The site is in close proximity to the settlement boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2070.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential use on Poultry Packing Plant, 30B Marshfield Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- Representation Text: No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- Representation Text: No. If successful and subject to planning approvals, we would expect to start development within 1-3 years.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- Representation Text: Yes. The current residential boundary line for Castleton would need to be extended eastwards to include the site.
- Council Response: The site is allocated as Countryside and Green Wedge at present.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- Representation Text: No. Not to our knowledge

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
- Representation Text: No. Not to our knowledge

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
- Representation Text: No. Not to our knowledge

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
- Representation Text: Please refer to the attached sheet.

Information is to be scanned and attached as a viewable file to this representation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2070.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential use on Poultry Packing Plant, 30B Marshfield Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** 9

**Map Included?**

- Yes.
Question: Overall Council Response

The site is a Greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Christchurch, designated as Countryside. There are archaeological constraints on the site. There are hedgerows on the site and a Public Right of Way adjacent to the site.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.

Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8

It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated as Countryside and that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation.

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Land adjacent and south of Catsash Road, Christchurch, Newport, Gwent

Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: Land adjacent and south of Catsash Road, Christchurch, Newport, Gwent

Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Representation Text: 334700 x 189300

Council Response: 334728 189283

Question: 2.4 Site Area

Representation Text: 0.14 hectare

Council Response: 0.14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Field below Holy Trinity church sloping steeply down to M4 motorway</td>
<td>Un-used agricultural</td>
<td>2 houses and nature reserve</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Attractive local landscape dominated by the tower of Holy Trinity Church. Development on Christchurch Hill Lane visible from M4. Proposed housing will not be visible from M4 or Catash Road.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Hedge to be retained adjacent to Catash Road. Mature trees bordering M4 to be retained. More tree planting proposed.</td>
<td>The majority area of the field would become a nature reserve where birds &amp; other wildlife could be encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Unkused agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2 houses and nature reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>No longer in agricultural use. Formerly pasture now covered in brambles &amp; shrubs</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. The site is unlikely to be BMV as the slopes are greater than 7 degrees across extensive parts of it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Countryside Comments: No broad countryside issues. Site specifics would have to be considered, trees visual impact ecology etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
<td>Late?</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status Modified</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development and nature reserve on land adjacent to Catash Road, Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Possible Medieval settlement. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

- **Representation Text:** There is a natural spring at the bottom end of the field.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

- **Representation Text:** No. The top of the field will be levelled to take 2No. Dwellings.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Listed building n/a
  - Ancient monuments n/a
  - historic park n/a
  - conservation area n/a
  - Within Newport boundary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2071.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**
Representation Text: Yes. Very limited No. of cars, etc. From 2No. Dwellings - Christchurch Hill Lane and Catsash Road have fairly low levels of traffic.
Council Response: Yes about highway.
Visibility splays of 2.4 by 90 metres required
site only 30 metre frontage. Vis splay will require removal of hedge

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**
Representation Text: . Easier access to nature reserve - at present access is blocked by high brambles.
Council Response: The proposed development falls within the Caerleon Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 3.64Ha. Owing to the small size of the site an off-site contributions for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**
Representation Text: . As existing

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**
Representation Text: . Short distance
Council Response: 350 metres

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**
Representation Text: . 1 per hour, but within walking distance of Chepstow Road with more frequent buses
Council Response: 30 min - 1hr service

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**
Representation Text: . 3/4 - 1 mile
Council Response: newport station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
Representation Text: . Within walking distance of Chepstow Road with its many shops.
Council Response: 700m chepstow rd
1 store
1.2km post office christchurch rd

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2071.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**
by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

| Summary: Candidate site for residential development and nature reserve on land adjacent to Catash Road, Christchurch |

| Representation Text | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |

| Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling? | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |
| Representation Text | Short walk to the Celtic Manor Golf Club |
| Council Response | on site provision |

| Representation Text | Yes. Public footpath adjacent to site |
| Council Response | 387/47, just outside, alongside boundary. |

| Question: 4.9 Open Space? | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |
| Representation Text | Site would include usable open space, also near Celtic Manor Golf Course |
| Council Response | There is no open space in close proximity to the site |

| Question: 5.1 Schools? | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |
| Representation Text | Yes. Community Centre adjacent to site. School nearby on Chepstow road - a short walk away |

| Question: 5.2 Community Engagement? | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |
| Representation Text | Yes. Letters of support. Local people would like to see this site improved and have little objection to 2No. Quality houses. |

| Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations? | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |
| Representation Text | The proposed development would upgrade and improve the area. People are concerned about brambles, etc encroaching on their gardens and would welcome better management of the site. |

| Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities? | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |
| Representation Text | No. |

| Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity? | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |
| Representation Text | All adjacent except sewage-septic tanks proposed. |

| Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues? | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |
| Representation Text | No. |

| Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity? | Very accessible. Newport City Centre about 3/4 mile away. Church, Public House, Community Centre nearby |
### Representation Text: Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

---

### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representation Text:** No.

---

### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representation Text:** There is already development on 3 sides of the site - 'The Friars' and 'Church House' opposite the community centre and the houses along Christchurch Lane.

**Council Response:** The site is adjacent to the village boundary.

---

### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

**Representation Text:** Not at all, because there is no access or suitable sites nearby.

---

### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

---

### Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

**Representation Text:** Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2071.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for residential development and nature reserve on land adjacent to Catash Road, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
*Representation Text:* Yes. The proposed 2No. Dwellings are outlined in red and the proposed nature reserve is outline in blue.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
*Representation Text:* Yes. 1-3 years

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
*Representation Text:* Yes. The top end of the field should have the boundary moved so that it falls within the urban area.
*Council Response:* The site is currently allocated as Countryside in the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
*Representation Text:* No.
*Council Response:* ERECTION OF TWO DWELLINGS 93/0449 09/07/1993 Refused No computer record

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**
*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**
*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 8 Other Information?**
*Representation Text:* A view of the tower of Holy Trinity Church can be seen from the M4 motorway, but 'Church House', 'The Friars' and 'High Trees' cannot be seen. The proposed 2No. New dwellings are below the level of these existing dwellings and would therefore be even less visible from the M4 motorway and further afield. New tree planting would further hide any development. Most of the field is steeply sloping and there would be no chance of developing this for housing in the future; it needs to be properly managed as a nature reserve. Fumes and noise from the M4 motorway would be held back by the propsals and this would be welcomed by local people, particularly those living along Christchurch Lane.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**
*Representation Text:* Yes. See enclosed
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2072</th>
<th>Newbridge Estates Ltd</th>
<th>Agent: Boyer Planning - Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (1)

**Site:** 20/ Gloch Wen(1)

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

---

**Question**

**Representation Texts**

**Question: SA Recommendation**

**Council Response:**

Would provide a substantial increase to the current settlement size, depending on the proportion of open space provided. It is recommended that the proportion of open space is substantial to reduce this effect.

It should be ensured that any PROWs are enhanced through the development of the site.

Adjacent to SINC (Ebbw River) - it is recommended that development is not permitted which may encroach or negatively affect the SINC. The ecological value of the site should be investigated and any potential effects mitigated before commencement of development. Similarly, the quality of the watercourse should be enhanced where possible.

Any trees, especially those protected by TPOs, should be retained on the site and their integrity maintained.

The importance of all hedgerows on site should be evaluated, and these features should be maintained where they are important to local biodiversity as part of a wider scheme to enhance ecological connectivity through the provision of green infrastructure.

SAM adjacent - it should be ensured that the setting of the SAM is not negatively affected by development.

The development of the site would lead to the loss of allotments - it should be ensured that development provides alternative provision, in favourable locations for those who currently use this community facility.

It should be ensured that walking and cycling routes are enhanced and connect to the wider area, not only to include the stated routes to school and employment, but other local services and facilities such as health also.

---

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

The westerly corner of the candidate site has planning permission for residential development with replacement allotments to the north (ref: 09/0997 & 11/0254). These will be allocated as such in the Local Development Plan.

The remaining part of the candidate site is a greenfield site, positioned outside of the urban settlement. The land forms part of the SLA 2 - West of Rhiwderin, having scored a high value in the LANDMAP assessment.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council's strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council's strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

In addition, the plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make the best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

It is therefore recommended that the candidate site is not included in the Local Development Plan as it is not needed in housing requirement terms and would be contrary to the LDP Strategy.

---

**Question:** Site Name

**Representation Text:** Land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.2 Location**  
*Representation Text:* Land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin, NP10 8RY  
*Council Response:*  

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**  
*Representation Text:* ST 262875  
*Council Response:* 326462187550

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**  
*Representation Text:* 14.88HA

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**  
*Representation Text:* Both within and immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary, sloping site contained by mature hedgerows adjoining built development on 3 boundaries

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**  
*Representation Text:* Allotments, grazing & pasture land  
*Council Response:* allotment and countryside

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**  
*Representation Text:* Residential and open space

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**  
*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**  
*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**  
*Representation Text:* No.  
*Council Response:* Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. This site has previously been surveyed (020-97) and was demonstrated to be subgrade 3b on slope.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**  
*Representation Text:* Land within and on edge of settlement, enclosed by built development on three sides  
*Countryside Comments:*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?</td>
<td>Yes. Hedgerows separating fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: Group consisting of 20 alder, 2 oak, 1 ash, 18 Mon Oak Several Trees consisting of 1 elm of beech, oak Rowen and Birch. Hedgerow trees TPO potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</td>
<td>Maintenance of certain hedgerows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16 Archaeology?</td>
<td>Yes. There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Earthworks) to the north west of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Close to Rhiwderin Hillfort, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Gloch Wen is a post-medieval farm that is likely to have had a medieval precursor. Fairly Significant Restriction. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation and with proviso that the impact on the setting of the scheduled monument could restrict development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Greenfield?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Flood Risk?</td>
<td>Yes. A small section of the site on the eastern boundary is within Zone B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to the size and location it is easily addressed by avoiding development on the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: The site is adjacent to the river ebbw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td>Yes. Ebbw River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.7** SSSI?
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.8** Protected Species?
Representation Text: Yes. Overall the site is of limited ecological value.
Council Response: There are species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

**Question: 3.9** Conservation Area or Listed Building?
Representation Text: No.
Council Response: Scheduled ancient monument in adjacent field
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments (castle work)
- Historic park n/a
- Conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1** Access to Highway?
Representation Text: Yes. Principal access via an improved junction onto Harlech Drive and additional proposed new secondary access onto Harlech Drive.
The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.
Council Response: Yes - Harlech Drive and un-named road to the rear Tradegar Street.
T.A required to assess specific proposals.

**Question: 4.10** Open Space Linkage Improvement?
Representation Text: The existing links between the site and open space are adequate
Council Response: The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required to meet the immediate needs of the local young people, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11** Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
Representation Text: The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

**Question: 4.2** Bus Route?
Representation Text: 250 metres from the site
## Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
Representation Text: 8 buses per hour (service number 50 & 51)
Council Response: 30 min frequency

## Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
Representation Text: Rogerstone Station is circa 2.2km
Council Response: Newport

## Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
Representation Text: There is a post office and shop located on Pentre Tai Road, approximately 200m from the site.
Council Response: Post Office and small shop in Tredegar St.

## Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
Representation Text: Pentrepoeth Primary School is approximately 800m from the site. Basseleg Comprehensive School is approximately 1.5km from the site. Employment opportunities at Rogerstone (The Wern and Tregwilym Industrial Estates) are within reasonable cycling distances (Less than 3km)

## Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
Representation Text: Pentrepoeth Primary School and Basseleg Comprehensive School is approximately 1.5km from the site - within walking and cycling distance from the site.
Council Response: Links to existing infrastructure.

## Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
Representation Text: Yes. Public footpath numbers 3, 31 and 51
Council Response: 393/7 393/73 & 103

## Question: 4.9 Open Space?
Representation Text: Children’s Play Area on Chapel Terrace adjacent to the site

## Question: 5.1 Schools?
Representation Text: Yes. Pentrepoeth Primary School - 0.5km
Basseleg Comp - 1.2km
Community Centre - 0.18km
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P M W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

Representation Text: Improved mix and choice of housing

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

Representation Text: No. Site allows for relocation of existing facilities. Therefore not resulting in a loss.

Council Response: loss of allotment

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

Representation Text: The site is both within and adjacent to the settlement boundary and existing residential area where connections to mains networks are available on local highways.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

Representation Text: Yes.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

**Sewerage**

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewerage treatment**

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

- Representation Text: The site is both within and adjoining the existing settlement which provides appropriate facilities and infrastructure and is contained by strong defensible boundaries.

**Council Response:** The site is partly within the settlement boundary whilst the majority is outside of the settlement boundary.

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

- Stand alone development

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

- Representation Text: Area of the site already within the settlement boundary to be retained. Remainder of the site to be included within the settlement boundary and removal from countryside designation.

**Council Response:** The site is currently allocated as allotment within the settlement boundary and Countryside outside of the settlement boundary.

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** DEVELOPMENT OF LAND BY THE ERECTION OF 79 DWELLINGS:DETAILS TO COMPLY WITH OUTLINE PERMISSION 1/17165 89/0464 07/01/1990 Approved

No computer record
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE)
97/0089 21/05/1997 Refused
No computer record

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 140 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PUBLIC OPEN SPACES LANDSCAPING AND ACCESS (OUTLINE)
99/0930 01/04/2009 Refused
No computer record

08/1428 01/04/2009 Refused
HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION (HIGHWAYS): No objection
GWENT POLICE: No objection
CADW: The development is located within the vicinity of the scheduled ancient monument known as Ringwork 225m north east of Rhiwderyn (MM066). The scheduled Medieval Ringwork is divided into three pasture fields by mature hedges. The earthworks have been levelled by ploughing over recent centuries and remain most prominent on the east side where they overlook the Ebbw valley. Cadw considers that there are no public rights of way to the monument. There will be some effect on the setting of the monument but no serious concerns are raised.
SOUTH WALES FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE: Need for the provision of adequate water supplies on the site for fire fighting purposes and access for emergency fire fighting appliances.
GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: Requests that a condition be imposed requiring a watching brief
WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION: Has provided details regarding its apparatus.
GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: Has no objection to bat survey and ecological enhancements
DWR CYMRUWELSH WATER: Has stated that foul and surface water discharges shall be drained separately from the site. The site is crossed by a public sewer.
ERECTION OF TWELVE APARTMENTS TO PROVIDE ACCOMMODATION FOR THE ELDERLY (AFFECTING PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY 393/73)
08/1429 01/04/2009 Refused
AS APPLICATION 08/1428

---

Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
Representation Text: Yes. A small part of the site (allotments and some adjoining land) was subject to planning applications in 2008:
08/1428 & 08/1429

Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 8 Other Information?
Representation Text: 

Question: 9 Map Included?
Representation Text: Yes.
SA Recommendation

Would provide a substantial increase to the current settlement size, depending on the proportion of open space provided. It is recommended that the proportion of open space is substantial to reduce this effect.

It should be ensured that any PROWs are enhanced through the development of the site.

Adjacent to SINC (Ebbw River) - it is recommended that development is not permitted which may encroach or negatively affect the SINC. The ecological value of the site should be investigated and any potential effects mitigated before commencement of development. Similarly, the quality of the watercourse should be enhanced where possible.

Any trees, especially those protected by TPOs, should be retained on the site and their integrity maintained.

The importance of all hedgerows on site should be evaluated, and these features should be maintained where they are important to local biodiversity as part of a wider scheme to enhance ecological connectivity through the provision of green infrastructure.

SAM adjacent - it should be ensured that the setting of the SAM is not negatively affected by development.

The development of the site would lead to the loss of allotments - it should be ensured that development provides alternative provision, in favourable locations for those who currently use this community facility.

It should be ensured that walking and cycling routes are enhanced and connect to the wider area, not only to include the stated routes to school and employment, but to other local services and facilities such as health also.

Overall Council Response

The westerly corner of the candidate site has planning permission for residential development with replacement allotments to the north (ref: 09/0997 & 11/0254). These will be allocated as such in the Local Development Plan.

The remaining part of the candidate site is a greenfield site, positioned outside of the urban settlement. The land forms part of the SLA 2 - West of Rhiwderin, having scored a high value in the LANDMAP assessment.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council's strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council's strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

In addition, the plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

It is therefore recommended that the candidate site is not included in the Local Development Plan as it is not needed in housing requirement terms and would be contrary to the LDP Strategy.

Site Name

Land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.2 Location**

Representation Text: Land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin, NP10 8RY

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

Representation Text: ST 262875

Council Response: 326462 187550

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

Representation Text: 9.88HA

Council Response: 10.38ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

Representation Text: Both within and immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary, sloping site contained by mature hedgerows adjoining built development on 3 boundaries

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

Representation Text: Allotments, grazing & pasture land

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

Representation Text: Residential and open space

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

Representation Text: Land within and on edge of settlement, enclosed by built development on three sides

### Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Hedgerows separating fields

**Council Response:**
- TPO 18/mon (group, individual and area)
- Hedgerow trees TPO potential

### Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

**Representation Text:** Maintenance of certain hedgerows

### Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 3.16 Archaeology?

**Representation Text:** Yes. There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Earthworks) to the north west of the site.

**Council Response:**
- Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Gloch Wen is a post-medieval farm that is likely to have had a medieval precursor. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

### Question: 3.2 Greenfield?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?

**Representation Text:** Yes. A small section of the site on the eastern boundary is within Zone B.

**Council Response:**
- Due to the size and location it is easily addressed by avoiding development on the area.

### Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Ebbw River

### Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 3.7 SSSI?

**Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2072.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Species?</td>
<td>Yes. Overall the site is of limited ecological value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>There are species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The site is adjacent to the SINC ebbw river</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area or Listed Building?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Listed building (yes 1 on the border)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient monuments n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historic park n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conservation area n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Within Newport boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Highway?</td>
<td>Yes. Principal access via an improved junction onto Harlech Drive and additional proposed new secondary access onto Harlech Drive. The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes Horlech Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>un-named road is rear of Tredegar St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required to meet the immediate needs of the local young people, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</td>
<td>The existing links between the site and open space are adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required to meet the immediate needs of the local young people, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</td>
<td>The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>250 metres from the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Caerphilly Road 300m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Route?</td>
<td>250 metres from the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>250 metres from the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>Caerphilly Road 300m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status Modified</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Railway Station?</td>
<td>2072.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 buses per hour (service number 50 &amp; 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 min frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Convenience Shop?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogerstone Station is circa 2.2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a post office and shop located on Pentre Tai Road, approximately 200m from the site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Office and Small shop in tredegar St - at 100m site edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pentrepoth Primary School is approximately 800m from the site. Basseleg Comprehensive School is approximately 1.5km from the site. Employment opportunities at Rogerstone (The Wern and Tregwilym Industrial Estates) are within reasonable cycling distances (Less than 3km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pentrepoth Primary School and Bassaleg Comprehensive School are approximately 1.5km from the site - within walking and cycling distance from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Links to existing infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Walking and Cycling?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Public Rights of Way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROW 393/7 &amp; 393/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>393/73 &amp; 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Open Space?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children's Play Area on Chapel Terrace adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is near informal open space at Glochwen and Equipped open space at Glochwen/Graig Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Pentrepoth Primary School - 0.5km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bassaleg Comp - 1.2km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Centre - 0.18km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Community Engagement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Poly</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:** Improved mix and choice of housing

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:** No. Site allows for relocation of existing facilities. Therefore not resulting in a loss.

**Council Response:** The site would result in the loss of allotments

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:** The site is both within and adjacent to the settlement boundary and existing residential area where connections to mains networks are available on local highways.

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:**

- Sewerage
  
  Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

  Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

  Water supply

  It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

  Sewerage treatment

  No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** No.
### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?
- **Representation Text:** The site is both within and adjoining the existing settlement which provides appropriate facilities and infrastructure and is contained by strong defensible boundaries.
- **Council Response:** Part of the site is within the settlement boundary and part is directly adjacent to the settlement boundary.

### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?
- **Representation Text:** Stand alone development

### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 7.2 Site Owner?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Area of the site already within the settlement boundary to be retained. Remainder of the site to be included within the settlement boundary and removal from countryside designation.
- **Council Response:** Part of the site is allocated as an allotment site, whilst the rest is allocated as Countryside within the UDP

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
- **Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. A small part of the site (allotments and some adjoining land) was subject to planning applications in 2008: 08/1428 & 08/1429

### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

---

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 8** Other Information?

**Representation Text:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 9</th>
<th>Map Included?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C3</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 131/ Glochwen Rhiwderin (3)

**Issue:** LDP DA Candidate Sites

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

- Would provide a substantial increase to the current settlement size, depending on the proportion of open space provided. It is recommended that the proportion of open space is substantial to reduce this effect.
- It should be ensured that any PROWs are enhanced through the development of the site.
- Adjacent to SINC (Ebbw river) - it is recommended that development is not permitted which may encroach or negatively affect the SINC. The ecological value of the site should be investigated and any potential effects mitigated before commencement of development. Similarly, the quality of the watercourse should be enhanced where possible.
- Any trees, especially those protected by TPOs, should be retained on the site and their integrity maintained.
- The importance of all hedgerows on site should be evaluated, and these features should be maintained where they are important to local biodiversity as part of a wider scheme to enhance ecological connectivity through the provision of green infrastructure.
- SAM adjacent - it should be ensured that the setting of the SAM is not negatively affected by development.
- The development of the site would lead to the loss of allotments - it should be ensured that development provides alternative provision, in favourable locations for those who currently use this community facility.
- It should be ensured that walking and cycling routes are enhanced and connect to the wider area, not only to include the stated routes to school and employment, but to other local services and facilities such as health also.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

The candidate site has planning permission for residential development with associated replacement allotments on land to the north ref: 09/0097 & 11/0254.

It is recommended that the Local Development Plan allocates the residential site as a housing commitment and allocates land to the north as an allotment site.

**Question: 2.1** Site Name

**Representation Text:**

- Land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.2 Location**

- **Representation Text:** Land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin, NP10 8RY

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

- **Representation Text:** ST 261875
- **Council Response:** 325175 167517

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**

- **Representation Text:** 1.28HA
- **Council Response:** 1.37ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**

- **Representation Text:** Within the settlement boundary, former allotments and disused farm buildings on gently sloping site contained by mature hedgerows

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**

- **Representation Text:** Allotments and redundant barns

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**

- **Representation Text:** Residential and open space

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**

- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** The site is Greenfield

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representation Text:** Land within settlement boundary and well related to surrounding development
- **Council Response:** Countryside Comments: Incursion into valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Area within proposed SLA 2 West Of Rhiwderin. Tree, visual impact, historic, PROW issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Hedgerows along the site boundary
- **Council Response:** There are no TPOs on the site
- **Representation Text:** Hedgerow trees TPO potential

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**
- **Representation Text:** Maintenance of certain hedgerows

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Earthworks) to the north of the site.
- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Adjacent to possible medieval site at Gloch Wen. Minimal Restraint. Conditions may be placed on planning consent. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
- **Representation Text:** No. Currently allotments and redundant barns
- **Council Response:** The site is Greenfield

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Overall the site is of limited ecological value. However, there is limited evidence of bats within the barns this can be mitigated against.

**Council Response:**
There is a species noted on the site as recorded by South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- Listed building (yes 1 on the border)
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Principal access via an improved junction onto Harlech Drive and additional proposed new secondary access onto Harlech Drive. The highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

**Council Response:**
- Yes- un-named road to rear of Tredegar St.
- Local widening of road needed.
- Works agreed in principle under recent planning application.
- T.A submitted.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- The existing links between the site and open space are adequate

**Council Response:**
- The proposed development falls within the Graig Ward which has a shortfall in play space of 6.69Ha. Owing to the isolation of the site it is proposed that a LAP would be provided to meet the immediate needs of the local young people. Although the development will provide outdoor play space it will still add to the overall deficit by increasing the local population, consequently it is proposed to request off-site contributions to improve formal play provision locally.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

**Council Response:**
- 250 metres from the site
- Caerphilly road- 300m

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
- 250 metres from the site

**Council Response:**
- Caerphilly road- 300m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
- 8 buses per hour (service number 50 & 51)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Railway Station?</td>
<td>Rogerstone Station is circa 2.2km</td>
<td>Newport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Convenience Shop?</td>
<td>There is a post office and shop located on Pentre Tai Road, approximately 200m from the site.</td>
<td>Shop and Post Office at Tredegar St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Jobs &amp; Community Services Accessibility?</td>
<td>Pentrepoeth Primary School is approximately 800m from the site. Basseleg Comprehensive School is approximately 1.5km from the site. Employment opportunities at Rogerstone (The Wern and Tregwilym Industrial Estates) are within reasonable cycling distances (Less than 3km)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Walking and Cycling?</td>
<td>Pentrepoeth Primary School and Basseleg Comprehensive School are approximately 1.5km from the site - within walking and cycling distance from the site.</td>
<td>Links to existing infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Public Rights of Way?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>PROW 393/73 393/ 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Open Space?</td>
<td>Children's Play Area on Chapel Terrace adjacent to the site</td>
<td>The site is near informal open space at Glochwen and Equipped open space at Glochwen/Graig Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Schools?</td>
<td>Pentrepoeth Primary School - 0.5km Basseleg Comp - 1.2km Community Centre - 0.18km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Community Engagement?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**
Improved mix and choice of housing

---

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**
Replacement allotments can be provided within land under the control of the representor.

**Council Response:**
Allotment

---

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:**
The site is within the settlement boundary and adjacent to the existing residential area where connections to mains networks are available on local highways.

---

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

---

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Council Response:**
Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the level of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

---

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:**
No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Poly</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** The site is within the existing settlement which provides appropriate facilities and infrastructure

**Council Response:** The site is within the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** Stand alone development

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Removal of allotment allocation within settlement boundary

**Council Response:** The site is allocated as Allotment in the UDP

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. 08/1428 - Outline application for residential development, new allotments and elderly accommodation 08/1429 - Full application for 12 Elderly apartments

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** No.
### Question: 9 Other Information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2072.C3</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential and open space development on land at Glochwen, Rhiwderin (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation Text:  

**Representation Text:** 
Yes.
Summary: Candidate site for residential development at land at Risca Road (1)

Site: 51/ Risca Road (1)

Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites

**Question: SA Recommendation**

- Trees/Hedgerows on site should be retained where deemed beneficial for the enhancement or maintenance of biodiversity and green infrastructure.
- SINC Oaktree cottage fields, Monmouthshire B Canals (Crumlin Arm); Newport Environmental Space (Policy CE33); Cefn Council Wood (East & West) is a SINC - it should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted.
- The design of development should seek to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area. This could include the enhancement of the canal as a tourism attraction and the inclusion of tourist accommodation in the designations. This will also include the avoidance of any pollution to the watercourse.
- It is recommended that there is no loss to community facilities, notably the allotments under site 1232.C1 and 53.C1. This part of the site should be retained as allotments.
- The development of the settlement should ensure that there is an appropriate range of local services and facilities within walking distance from residences, including health employment and education.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

- The candidate site is a greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Rogerstone. The site is identified as a green wedge in the Preferred Strategy to avoid the coalescence of the urban areas of Rogerstone and Risca. The green wedge allocation is proposed to be carried forward into the Deposit Local Development Plan.
- There are a number of environmental constraints associated with the site including a SINC designation and a South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre record.
- Furthermore, the allocation of the site is not needed to meet the housing requirement set out for the plan period. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.
- The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council's strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council's strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.
- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

- It is recommended that the site continues to be allocated as a green wedge and is therefore not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing site.

Representation Text: Land at Risca Road (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Grid Reference</td>
<td>2073.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for residential development at land at Risca Road (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Site Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Brief Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Current Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Brownfield?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Agricultural Land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response: Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. There is a low probability of there being BMV at this site. Much of the area is ruled out on slopes (greater than 11 degrees). A pre revision survey (13-85 Rhiwderin) found 3b directly to the North on a flat area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response: Countryside Comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and fringe Public Open Space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02/2012</td>
<td>Page 905 of 968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.13</td>
<td>Trees and Hedgerows?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Trees along northern boundary separating the site from the canal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.15</td>
<td>Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Potential link to canal corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.16</td>
<td>Archaeology?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.2</td>
<td>Greenfield?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.3</td>
<td>Contaminated Land Risk?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.4</td>
<td>Flood Risk?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.5</td>
<td>Adjacent to Water Course?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Monmouthshire &amp; Brecon Canal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.6</td>
<td>Topography / Stability Problems?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 3.7</td>
<td>SSSI?</td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Green Wedge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Question: 3.8 Protected Species?

**Representation Text:**
There is a South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre record for the site.

**Council Response:**
No. Not that we are aware

## Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?

**Representation Text:**
Adjacent to Canal Conservation Area

**Council Response:**
Listed building (1 listed building)
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a

Within Newport boundary

## Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?

**Representation Text:**
The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.

**Council Response:**
The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
Principal access formed direct onto Risca Road.

**Council Response:**
The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required to meet the immediate needs of the local young people, combined with off-site contributions for formal play, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Principal access formed direct onto Risca Road.

**Council Response:**
40m from the site on the B4591 Risca Road.
### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
- **Representation Text:** 26 buses per hour (service numbers 5, 56, 151, R1, R3 x 16).
- **Council Response:** 5-10 mins (0710-1900)

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Representation Text:** Rogerstone station is circa 0.5km
- **Council Response:** rogerstone 0.8km

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** 900m to the morrison's superstore; new Tesco local approved at 750m distance, existing parade of shops and post office at St John's Crescent 700m from site.
- **Council Response:** morrisons , mcdonalds etc. 1.6km

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** Risca comprehensive school is approx 800m from the site, there are a number of employment opportunities located within 1.5km.
- **Council Response:** Risca Comprehensive School - 0.8km

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?
- **Representation Text:** There is a good standard of footway on Risca Road adjacent to the site and there os cycle track/route to the north of the site.
- **Council Response:** good link to NCN 47 canal path.
  *No flyway fronting access at risca rd*
  development should include improvements and on site facilities.

### Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Towing path adjacent to site.
- **Council Response:** PROW 406/6

### Question: 4.9 Open Space?
- **Representation Text:** 710m to recreation and sports ground to the north of site off Pontymason Lane.
- **Council Response:** Within 150m of informal space at Afon Village Area B Cedar Wood Close

### Question: 5.1 Schools?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Risca Comprehensive School - 0.8km
Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?
Representation Text: Improved mix and choice of housing.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?
Representation Text: The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?
Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?
Representation Text: Yes.

Welsh Water Comments
Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

- **Newport City Council Local Development Plan**
- **Stage=C; not submitted Late**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2073.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development at land at Risca Road (1)

- **Sewerage treatment**: No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**
- **Representation Text:** Well contained urban extension bound on 2 sides by residential development
- **Council Response:** The site is directly adjacent to the settlement boundary

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**
- **Representation Text:** Stand alone development

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. 1-3 years.

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Extension to settlement boundary and removal from green wedge / countryside.
- **Council Response:** The site is currently allocated as Countryside and Green Wedge in the UDP, and outside settlement boundary

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2073.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development at land at Risca Road (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: 9 Map Included?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text: Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2073.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed use of land at Risca Road (2) for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:** 52/ Risca Road (2)

**Question:** SA Recommendation

**Council Response:**

Trees/Hedgerows on site should be retained where deemed beneficial for the enhancement or maintenance of biodiversity and green infrastructure.

SINC Oaktree cottage fields, Monmouthshire B Canals (Crumlin Arm); Newport Environmental Space (Policy CE33); Cefn Council Wood (East & West) is a SINC - it should be ensured that potential for protected species is investigated and mitigated where possible before development is permitted.

The design of development should seek to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area. This could include the enhancement of the canal as a tourism attraction and the inclusion of tourist accommodation in the designations. This will also include the avoidance of any pollution to the watercourse.

It is recommended that there is no loss to community facilities, notably the allotments under site 1232.C1 and 53.C1. This part of the site should be retained as allotments.

The development of the settlement should seek to ensure that there is an appropriate range of local services and facilities within walking distance from residences, including health facilities. It should be ensured that the development of the sites incorporates walking and cycling routes to connect to the national cycle network as well as to services and facilities including employment and education.

**Question:** Overall Council Response

**Council Response:**

The candidate site is a greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Rogerstone. The site is identified as a green wedge in the Preferred Strategy to avoid the coalescence of the urban areas of Rogerstone and Risca. The green wedge allocation is proposed to be carried forward into the Deposit Local Development Plan.

There are a number of environmental constraints associated with the site including a SINC designation and a South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre record.

Furthermore, the allocation of the site is not needed to meet the housing requirement set out for the plan period. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council's strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council's strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong> Site Name</td>
<td>Land at Risca Road (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong> Location</td>
<td>Land at Risca Road, Rogerstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3</strong> Grid Reference</td>
<td>ST 262893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4</strong> Site Area</td>
<td>4.8ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5</strong> Brief Description</td>
<td>Greenfield site abutting built up area rising gently towards canal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.6</strong> Current Use</td>
<td>Grazing Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7</strong> Proposed Use(s)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1</strong> Brownfield?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.10</strong> Minerals Safeguarding Area?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.11</strong> Agricultural Land?</td>
<td>Currently used for temporary grazing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

It is recommended that the site continues to be allocated as a green wedge and is therefore not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> The majority of the grazing land, apart from strong defensible tree line and wood on the northern boundary, has limited landscape value. The edge of settlement site is well contained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong> Countryside comments: Incursion into large, valuable area of countryside and fringe Public Open Space. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Public Open Space, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> Yes. Trees along northern boundary separating the site from the canal. Several trees in hedgerows have TPO’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong> 58/mon Hedgerow trees TPO potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> Retention of tree buffer and woodland on northern boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> Yes. Potential link to canal corridor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.16 Archaeology?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong> Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.2 Greenfield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong> Yes. Monmouthshire &amp; Brecon Canal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2073.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed use of land at Risca Road (2) for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.7**  
**SSI?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Green Wedge

*Council Response:* SINC Oaktree cottage fields, Monmouthshire Brecon Canals (Crumlin Arm)

**Question: 3.8**  
**Protected Species?**

*Representation Text:* No. Not that we are aware of

*Council Response:* There is a South East Wales Biodiversity Records Centre record for the site.

**Question: 3.9**  
**Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

*Representation Text:* No. Adjacent to canal conservation area

*Council Response:* Listed building n/a  
Ancient monuments n/a  
Historic park n/a  
Conservation area n/a  
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1**  
**Access to Highway?**

*Representation Text:* Yes. Principal access formed direct onto Risca Road. The Highway has sufficient capacity to accommodate the level of traffic generation.

Steep gradients.

**Question: 4.10**  
**Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

*Representation Text:*  
The existing links between the site and open space are adequate.

*Council Response:*  
The Rogerstone Ward has a shortfall in play space of 4.65Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required to meet the immediate needs of the local young people, combined with off-site contributions for formal play, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11**  
**Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

*Representation Text:*  
The development would be served by a good level of existing bus service. The bus stops for these services are conveniently located and within a reasonable walking distance from the site.

**Question: 4.2**  
**Bus Route?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2073.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed use of land at Risca Road (2) for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
- 40m from the site on the B4591 Risca Road

**Council Response:**
- 40m from Pontymason lane.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
- 26 buses per hour (service numbers 5, 56, 151, R1, R3 X16)

**Council Response:**
- 5 min freq

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
- Rogerstone station is Circa 0.5km

**Council Response:**
- Rogerstone 1.6km
- Newport 6km

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
- 900m to the Morrison's superstore; new Tesco local approved at 750m distance, existing parade of shops and post office at St John's Crescent 700m from the site.

**Council Response:**
- Risca comprehensive school 1km
- St Johns Crescent shops 800m
- Potential Tesco Express 800m

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
- Risca comprehensive school is approximately 800m from the site. There are a number of employment opportunities located within 1.5km.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**
- There is a good standard of footway on Risca Road adjacent to the site and there is cycle track/route to the north of the site.

**Council Response:**
- Good access to NCN 47 canal.
- Internal infrastructure to be provided.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. Towing path adjacent to site.

**Council Response:**
- PROW 406/6

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:**
- 710m to recreation and sports ground to the north of site off Pontymason Lane.

**Council Response:**
- The site is within 150m of informal space at Afon Village Area B Cedar Wood Close
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Question: 5.1 Schools?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Risca Comprehensive School - 0.8km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant Primary School - 1.2km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefn Wood Primary School - 1.2km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved mix and choice of housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is adjacent to the existing built up residential area where connections to mains network are available on the local highways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Welsh Water Comments**

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.4</th>
<th>Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.5</th>
<th>Logical Extension?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Well contained urban extension bound on 2 sides by residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 6.6</th>
<th>Precedent Setting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Stand alone development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.1</th>
<th>Site Owned by Proposer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.2</th>
<th>Site Owner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.3</th>
<th>Interest in Adjoining Land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.4</th>
<th>Restrictive Covenants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.5</th>
<th>Realistic Timescale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. 1-3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.6</th>
<th>Development Boundary Change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>Yes. Extension to settlement boundary and removal from green wedge/countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>The site is currently allocated as Green Wedge and Countryside in the UDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 7.7</th>
<th>Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2073.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

*Representation Text:* Yes.
Summary: Proposed allocation of land at Rock Farm, Penhow for residential use.

**Question: SA Recommendation**

- The protection of land for amenity space (2059.C1) is supported in sustainability term 2075.C2. The assessment in Table 3.5 is based on candidate site 2074.C1.
- It should be ensured that development seeks to minimise its effect on landscape quality and PROWs. This could be achieved through the implementation of extensive green infrastructure. As part of this, existing trees and hedges should be retained.
- It should be ensured that the setting of the listed building is not affected by development.
- It is recommended that the development of the site includes a convenience store due to its relatively remote location.
- Improvements to public transport and walking and cycling routes should be ensured ahead of development being permitted.

**Council Response:**

- The site is located in a divorced location from the Llanvaches village boundary.
- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.
- The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.
- It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question: Overall Council Response**

- The site is located in a divorced location from the river Llanvances village boundary.
- The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.
- The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.
- It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

**Question: 2.1 Site Name**

- Representation Text: Rock Farm, Penhow, Caldicot, Gwent

**Question: 2.2 Location**

- Representation Text: Rock Fountain between Penhow Film Studios and Rock and Foundation public house.
- Llanvaches Road, Penhow, Caldicot, Gwent NP26 3AD

**Question: 2.3 Grid Reference**

- Representation Text: ST428 915
- Council Response: 342731 191336

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodged</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2074.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Proposed allocation of land at Rock Farm, Penhow for residential use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations Text:**
- **Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
  - The land is to the rear of The Rock and Fountain pub and surrounds the film studio.

**Council Response:**
- **Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
  - 8.5 hectares

- **Question: 2.6 Current Use**
  - Agriculture

- **Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
  - Residential

- **Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
  - Yes. Prison camp during WW2 and a quarry
  - The site is Greenfield

- **Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
  - No. The site has been quarried and to the north is Penhow Quarry
  - The site is adjacent to Penhow Quarry

- **Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
  - Yes. Unable to find agricultural classification on www.magic.gov.uk
  - Welsh Government comment: High Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. This site has previously been surveyed and was determined to be subgrade 3a (050-93 Newport Borough LDP). There is a high probability of BMV at this site.

- **Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
  - The local landscape is rural however the site has obvious traits that it has been quarried in the past. The land is permanent pasture. The lands gradient gradullay rises upwards to the north. To the north is shelter belt of woodland. There is a village hall/scout hut to the east of the site.

- **Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
  - No. There are trees on the boundary with the Rock and Fountain near the existing Dutch Barn. There is a mature hedge along the roadside.

  - Trees with TPO potential
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2074.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed allocation of land at Rock Farm, Penhow for residential use.

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

Repr'tn Text: The existing site has been used for a number of uses. The land adjacent is used for non agricultural purposes.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

Repr'tn Text: No. The features that should be retained are the hedgerows and any mature trees.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

Repr'tn Text: No. Penhow castle and church opposite the A48.

Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

Repr'tn Text: No.

Council Response: The site is Greenfield

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

Repr'tn Text: No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

Repr'tn Text: No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

Repr'tn Text: No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

Repr'tn Text: No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

Repr'tn Text: No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

Repr'tn Text: No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

Repr'tn Text: No.
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**by:** Representation No

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2074.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Proposed allocation of land at Rock Farm, Penhow for residential use.

**Council Response:**

- Listed building (1 on border)
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a

- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. The land is adjacent to the A48 and Llanvaches Road.

**Council Response:**

- yes
- New junction requires vis splay of 4.5 x 90 metres.
- Transport assessment required

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

This development is adjacent to the open countryside with a footpath to the east of the site and Penhow Castle.

**Council Response:**

The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. On-site provision of a range of play facilities will be required to meet the immediate needs of the local young people, the extent of which cannot be determined until details of any future planning application is submitted as the rationale for requests are based on increased population.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**

There is public transport available and with more people living in the locality the more support public transport will get.

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**

At the Rock and Fountain pub the bus stops.

**Council Response:**

- 300 metres to edge of site

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**

6 per hour

**Council Response:**

- 30 min 1hour freq

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**

Chepstow and Newport (6 miles distant)

**Council Response:**

- Newport station
- Chepstow station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2074.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
- Penhow village shop which also delivers
- Church Village Hall which hosts a variety of classes
- Restaurant

**Council Response:**
- 2.5km to parc seymour village shop

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
**Representation Text:**
- The community has extensive facilities. The area has broadband.
**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
**Representation Text:**
- There is a foot path to the village centre and to the bus route.
**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
**Representation Text:**
- No. There is a foot path through adjacent fields to the east of the site.
**Council Response:**

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
**Representation Text:**
- There is a playing field within the neighbouring village of Parc Seymour.
**Council Response:**

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
**Representation Text:**
- Yes. Langstone Primary School, approximately 4 miles distant.
- Penhow has a shop, pub, village hall, restaurant and church.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
**Representation Text:**
- No.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
**Representation Text:**
- By providing a variety of styles of residential accommodation and services.

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
**Representation Text:**
- No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**
**Representation Text:**
- Water onsite
- Electricity and broadband adjacent to the site.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text: No. Infrastructure is available either on the land or the adjacent road and will be connected when required.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?</td>
<td>Minerals to the north and west of the site. Employment to the north-east and south of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Logical Extension?</td>
<td>There is development to the north and south of the site. It is likely that in the future, the quarry may be developed and this site could complement this development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Precedent Setting?</td>
<td>It is likely the quarry will be developed along with studios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Site Owned by Proposer?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Site Owner?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Interest in Adjoining Land?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td>Yes. 7 years plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Development Boundary Change?</td>
<td>Yes. It would need to be added to the LDF documents. This is an ideal site with the future possibilities at the quarry and the studio and the existing facilities of the public house and restaurant. The site is allocated as countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</td>
<td>No. CONSTRUCTION OF NEW CAR PARK EXTENSION OF EXISTING CAR PARK WITH SECURITY LIGHTING AND PROVISION OF PATIO AND AMENITY LIGHTING.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n/Para/Policy</td>
<td>AccessnNo</td>
<td>DateLodgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2074.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93/0383 02/07/1993 REFUSED IN BASEMENT

PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PARTLY BUILT APARTMENTS, NEW OFFICE DEVELOPMENT AND EXTENSION TO EXISTING BARN
00/0683 03/01/2001 GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS
NO SIGNIFICANT OBJECTIONS

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION FOR CONVERSION AND EXTENSION OF EXISTING BARN AND PROPOSED ERECTION OF TWO STOREY MOTEL ACCOMMODATION
02/1169 31/10/2002 WITHDRAWN

CONVERSION OF BARN FROM FUNCTION ROOM TO RESIDENTIAL DWELLING AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS INCLUDING ERECTION OF ENTRANCE HALL EXTENSION
01/0463 01/08/2001 GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

NEIGHBOURS: Penhow Film Studios, Penhow Quarry - one letter of objection received on the grounds that internal subdivision and extension of the former barn will be detrimental to its character and the inevitable creep of change that would follow in the wake of conversion would be an unfortunate change in the existing relationship of buildings. Also states that if the access relies on going over the adjoining Film Studio property, no notice has been served.

LLANVACHES COMMUNITY COUNCIL: Object on the grounds that the ability to see and use this building would be lost if converted. It is an amenity to the local community. Its loss coupled with the redevelopment of other parts of the site may perhaps lead to the loss of the pub itself. Increased traffic using the nearby junction at the A48 would exacerbate an already very dangerous situation.

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

*Representation Text: No.*

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

*Representation Text: Yes.*
### Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response:

It is recommended that the site does not go forward as part of the preferred development strategy for the following reasons:

- SINC designation - recommend don't develop if effect cannot be mitigated (exact location to be confirmed - designated area to be avoided);
- May affect setting of listed building;
- Landscape effect unclear as comment on form is ambiguous;
- Greenfield and loss of agricultural land;
- Poor public transport.

### Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response:

The site is a green field site in the open countryside of Newport. It is very remote from any settlement or village in Newport and as such is in a highly unsustainable location.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

### Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Tinkers Field, Michaelston-y-Fedw

### Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: Michaelston-y-Fedw, Cardiff, CF3 6XT

### Question: 2.3 Grid Reference

Representation Text: ST 2485 4141

Council Response: 324421 185454

### Question: 2.4 Site Area
### Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**Rep'n/Para/Policy** | **AccessnNo** | **DateLodgd** | **Late?** | **Source** | **Type** | **Mode** | **Status** | **Status Modified** | **Summary**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2075.C1 | 06/05/2009 | P | P | W | M | | | | Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Tinkers Field, Michaelston-y-Fedw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Representation Text</strong></th>
<th><strong>Council Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 2.5**  
**Brief Description**

- Triangular field developed on 2 sides by housing

**Question: 2.6**  
**Current Use**

- Agriculture

**Question: 2.7**  
**Proposed Use(s)**

- Residential

**Question: 2.8**  
**Brownfield?**

- No.

**Question: 2.10**  
**Minerals Safeguarding Area?**

- No.

**Question: 2.11**  
**Agricultural Land?**

- Yes. 3b

**Council Response:**  
Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. Centre of site limited to 3b on slope. Low probability of BMV due to slope despite favourable soils and climate.

**Question: 2.12**  
**Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- Not visible from road as is developed on the road frontage

**Council Response:**  
Countryside comments: Incursion into valuable open countryside. Potential landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of High value in LANDMAP. Within proposed SLA 1 Wentlooge Levels. Visual, Tree, Ecological, PROW issues

**Question: 2.13**  
**Trees and Hedgerows?**

- Yes. Not protected

**Council Response:**  
05/2005 Yew Tree

**Question: 2.14**  
**Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

- Streamside corridor + valley inc. 2 mature oaks to be retained

---
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**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**
Representation Text: Yes. Potential to create an access walkway along stream.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**
Representation Text: No.

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**
Representation Text: Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**
Representation Text: Yes. Streamside corridor to be protected

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**
Representation Text: Yes. Central stream feature to be retarded

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**
Representation Text: Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a
Within Newport boundary
### Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Minor additional traffic flow
- **Council Response:** Yes - Penlrepoeth Road. No- narrow, poor alignment, no footways, poor visibility available.

### Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** Streamside corridor walks
- **Council Response:** The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. There are no play facilities in the vicinity it is therefore proposed that a LEAP would need to be provided to meet the immediate needs of the young people on this development.

### Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?
- **Representation Text:** n/a

### Question: 4.2 Bus Route?
- **Representation Text:** 2 miles
- **Council Response:** A48 - 3km

### Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?
- **Representation Text:** 15-20 mins apart
- **Council Response:** 10-20 mins

### Question: 4.4 Railway Station?
- **Representation Text:** 6 miles
- **Council Response:** Newport 12km

### Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?
- **Representation Text:** 2 miles 6 shops
- **Council Response:** A48 - garage 3km
  - Marshfield shops 5km
  - Bassaleg 3.8km

### Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?
- **Representation Text:** 3 miles M4

### Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2075.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Tinkers Field, Michaelston-y-Fedw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**
Ncn 4 runs along site frontage.
No footways.

**Council Response:**
Ncn 4 runs along site frontage.
No footways.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.

**Council Response:**
Yes.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:**
On edge of countryside

**Council Response:**
On edge of countryside

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Marshfield / Bassaleg
Daily bus

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Landscape + Design

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Streamside corridor

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Water + electric to site
100km to main sewer

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:**
No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary

2075.C1 06/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Tinkers Field, Michaelston-y-Fedw

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water supply

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

A high level solution to increase supply to the whole area may be available by diverting flows from one of our trunk mains. However, funding for a solution of this nature would require input from all prospective developers.

Sewerage treatment

No problems are envisaged with respect to the treatment of flows generated by the proposals.

---

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

---

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** Infill area already bounded on 2 sides by development

**Council Response:** The site is divorced from the settlement boundary

---

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** n/a

---

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Adjoining householders. on northern boundary in favour

---

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.
### Representation 2075.C1

**Question 7.3: Interest in Adjoining Land?**

Representation Text: Yes.

**Question 7.4: Restrictive Covenants?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question 7.5: Realistic Timescale?**

Representation Text: Yes. Immediate

**Question 7.6: Development Boundary Change?**

Representation Text: Yes. Straight forward movement of settlement boundary to include hillside + Yewtree Cottage

Council Response: The site is currently allocated as Countryside

**Question 7.7: Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

Representation Text: No.

Council Response: ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION) 97/0037 17/12/1997 GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

**Question 7.8: Planning Application Refusals?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question 7.9: Planning Applications Pending?**

Representation Text: No.

**Question 8: Other Information?**

Representation Text: Hand drawn sketch of proposal - image to be scanned in and added to record.

**Question 9: Map Included?**

Representation Text: Yes. 1:5000

---

### Representation 2075.C2

**Question 7.3: Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question 7.4: Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question 7.5: Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question 7.6: Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question 7.7: Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question 7.8: Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question 7.9: Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question 8: Other Information?**

**Representation Text:**

**Question 9: Map Included?**

**Representation Text:**

---

**Newport City Council Local Development Plan**

**Site:** West of Six Bells, Peterstone Wentlooge

**Date:** 16/02/2012

**Pages:** 933 of 968
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
<td>SA Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>Minor development (2 x residential).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear whether brownfield or greenfield (contradictions in site form see 2.5, 3.1, 3.2) – potential flood risk issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No designated open space for recreation likely to lead to negative effects, from use of countryside areas for recreation, on designated sites for nature conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeologically sensitive area: any potential effects should be investigated and mitigated prior to development onsite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within the Peterstone: Llanbedr historic landscape characterisation area which may be affected by further development as the designation is &quot;characterised by trapezoidal blocks of very long, very narrow fields&quot; - the design of development should seek to ensure that the value of the landscape character is not negative affected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
<td>Overall Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>The site is regarded as greenfield land outside of (yet adjoining) the village settlement of Wentlooge. It is regarded as an area susceptible to flood risk and an unsustainable location for residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.1</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent 6 Bells Peterstone Wentlooge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.2</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent 6 Bells Peterstone Wentlooge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.3</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>ST 2680 5134 (approx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Response:</strong></td>
<td>ST 326666 180162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: 2.4</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation Text:</strong></td>
<td>0.6 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2075.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land adjacent 6 Bells Peterstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

**Question: 2.5** Brief Description

*Representation Text:* Previously developed land derelict building + hardcored area

**Question: 2.6** Current Use

*Representation Text:* Derelict

**Question: 2.7** Proposed Use(s)

*Representation Text:* 2x Dwelling house

**Question: 3.1** Brownfield?

*Representation Text:* Building and hardcored area

*Council Response:* This is a greenfield site

**Question: 3.10** Minerals Safeguarding Area?

*Representation Text:* No.

**Question: 3.11** Agricultural Land?

*Representation Text:* Adjacent to 3b

*Council Response:* Welsh Government comment: Low Probability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural land being present. This site is underlain by Newchurch 2 soils. There is a low probability of BMV at this site.

**Question: 3.12** Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?

*Representation Text:* Visible from road design to integrate into village


**Question: 3.13** Trees and Hedgerows?

*Representation Text:* Not protected

*Council Response:* No TPOs. Trees with TPO potential

**Question: 3.14** Biodiversity and Landscape Features?

*Representation Text:* Would ‘Tidy up’ an eyesore on the village boundary
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2075.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land adjacent 6 Bells Peterstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: Area in Registered Gwent Levels Historic Landscape and in Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Major Restraint. Impact on Registered Historic Landscape would be severe. Likelihood of significant archaeological site potentially of national importance. The area should not be allocated in LDP.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:** This is a greenfield site.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. 1:200 yr fluvial risk area Building design to compensate

**Council Response:** C1

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. SSSI designation but reen polluted by 6 Bells Pub

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

**Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Reens protected + Landscape protected by SSSI

**Council Response:** SSSI Gwent Levels - Rumney and Peterstone.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

**Representation Text:** No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2075.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land adjacent 6 Bells Peterstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:**
Listed building n/a
Ancient monuments n/a
historic park n/a
conservation area n/a

**Council Response:**
Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
Yes. Main road frontage

**Council Response:**
Yes - B4239 Broadstreet, Common.
Access - Visibility splays of 2.4m x 90m required.
-30mph limit
-visibility doesn't appear achievable is right.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
. n/a

**Council Response:**
The proposed development falls within the Marshfield Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 6.79Ha. Owing to the size of the site an off-site contribution for outdoor play facilities locally will be required.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
. adjacent to bus route

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
. 20 metres

**Council Response:**
Broadstreet Common.

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
. 1 x hourly

**Council Response:**
2 buses per day.

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
. 6 miles

**Council Response:**
Newport
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2075.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**
- **Representation Text:** 2 miles (1 shop)
- **Council Response:** Marshfield Road- Post Office and shop 3.1km

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**
- **Representation Text:** Very

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**
- **Representation Text:** Flat suitable for bicycles but best served by bus
- **Council Response:** No footways on B4239 on side of development.

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**
- **Representation Text:** n/a
- **Council Response:** The site has no open space in close proximity

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Marshfield 1 miles

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**
- **Representation Text:** Yes. Tidies area

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**
- **Representation Text:** Tidies area

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 5.5 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**
- **Representation Text:**

| 16/02/2012 | Page 938 of 968 |

---

Welsh Water Comments I would also point out that site 2075.C2 is crossed by a public foul sewer and development may be restricted dependant on the site layout.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2075.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development on land adjacent 6 Bells Peterstone

---

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

**Representation Text:** No.

---

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Adjoining sewerage station + water main in road

**Council Response:**

Welsh Water Comments

Can confirm that from a water supply, sewerage and sewage treatment perspective we would be able to accommodate the proposed candidate sites based on their current density.

---

**Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?**

**Representation Text:** No.

---

**Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?**

**Representation Text:** Rounds off village

**Council Response:**

The site is adjacent to the village boundary.

---

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:** neither

---

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Yes

---

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

---

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:** Yes.

---

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:** No.

---

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Immediate start

---

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

---
### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Stage=C; not submitted Late**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2075.C2</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on land adjacent 6 Bells Peterstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

**Representation Text:** Yes. Minor amendment to settlement boundary

**Council Response:** The site is allocated as Countryside and Green Belt in the UDP

#### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?
**Representation Text:** No.

**Council Response:**
- **ERECITION OF 3 NO. DWELLINGS**
  - **04/1092 17/08/2004 WITHDRAWN**

  HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: Existing access not adequate for proposed additional residential use. Require 4.5m x 215m visibility splay across land in the applicants control. To the east of the site is a car park for the public house and other properties which are not in the applicants control.

  OTHER OBJECTIONS RELATED TO POSITION OF EQUIPMENT.

#### Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?
**Representation Text:** No. No

#### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?
**Representation Text:** Yes.

#### Question: 8 Other Information?
**Representation Text:**
1. Previously developed land
2. On the edge of settlement boundary
3. Rounds off an area bounded by sewer station + pub
4. Removes overgrown derelict area

Previous applications
- 03/1586 Granted 2 July 2006
- 03/1210 Granted 10 Oct 2003
- 04/1320 Granted 5 Oct 2004
- 04/1092 Withdrawn 17/Aug/04

Withdrawn. Reason TAN 15 Flood Risk Assessment Zoning this assessment has altered favourably

#### Question: 9 Map Included?
**Representation Text:** Yes. 1:5000 Enclosed
Newport City Council Local Development Plan

2076 Morgan & Mr and Mrs G Akhtar, Mr & Mrs P

Agent: Derek Prosser Associates

Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary
2076.C1 06/05/2009 P W MP

Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Sneyd Lodge/Park

Site: 134/ Sneyd Lodge/Park

Issue: LDP DA Candidate Sites

Question

Representation Texts

Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response: Any public rights of way should be maintained and enhanced through development of the sites. One of the sites is a SINC (Sneyd Park Wood); TPOs on sites: Development on the site should seek to connect to and enhance the ecological value of the area. It is recommended that any development likely to harm the environmental designations or protected species should not be permitted. Listed buildings likely to be affected (setting): the design of development should ensure that this effect is not negative. Monmouthshire and Brecon Canal Conservation Area adjacent- walking and cycling routes to benefit from this asset should be enhanced. Any potential for the development of employment uses for the tourism industry should be encouraged (this should be explored prior to development for residential use to ensure that any potential isn’t lost).

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: The site is a Greenfield site located outside of the urban area of Malpas, designated as Green Wedge and Countryside. The Sneyd Wood, a site of nature importance (SINC), is located on the site. The land has also been identified as an area of moderate to high value in the LANDMAP assessment. There are a number of Tree Preservation Orders on the site.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of Greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities. Allocation of this site would therefore be contrary to the Council’s objective to make sustainable use of land.

Additional housing land on a Greenfield site in the countryside is not needed to meet the housing requirement. The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified.

The release of the representation site for housing would also be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales para. 9.2.8

It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated as Green Wedge and Countryside and that the Candidate Site is not included in the Local Development Plan as a housing allocation.

Question: 2.1 Site Name

Representation Text: Sneyd Lodge/ Sneyd Park

Question: 2.2 Location

Representation Text: Sneyd Lodge/ Sneyd Park

Maplas Road
NP20 6QB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2.3 Grid Reference</th>
<th>2.4 Site Area</th>
<th>2.5 Brief Description</th>
<th>2.6 Current Use</th>
<th>2.7 Proposed Use(s)</th>
<th>3.1 Brownfield?</th>
<th>3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?</th>
<th>3.11 Agricultural Land?</th>
<th>3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?</th>
<th>3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td>33001917</td>
<td>2.7 (approx)</td>
<td>Curtilage land attached to dwellings, grassland including trees (woodland)</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Land contained by strong treescapes as it falls towards Bettws. Development would be unobtrusive contained by landscape as it falls to west would be hardly visible from Malpas road.</td>
<td>Yes, Protection unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Council Response | 329998 191650 | 3.23ha | | | | | | | Incursion into valuable area of countryside. Adverse landscape visual and amenity impacts. Area of moderate to high value in LANDMAP. Tree, visual impact, historic, PROW issues. | 16/02/2012
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2076.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Sneyd Lodge/Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

*Representation Text:*
By careful layout and integration within development.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

*Representation Text:*
No. Currently within green wedge but this is futile in relation to adjoining Rougemont school development.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

*Representation Text:*
No.

*Council Response:*
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating in LDP.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

*Representation Text:*
Yes.

*Council Response:*
The majority of the site is greenfield.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

*Representation Text:*
No.

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

*Representation Text:*
No.

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

*Representation Text:*
No.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

*Representation Text:*
No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

*Representation Text:*
No.

*Council Response:*
SINC Sneyd Park Wood.

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

*Representation Text:*
No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2076.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

**Representation Text:**
- No.
- Listed building n/a
- Ancient monuments n/a
- historic park n/a
- conservation area n/a

**Council Response:**
- Within Newport boundary

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes.
- yes malpas rd.

**Council Response:**
- Current acess __substanded
- T.A to confirm impact and type of link required.

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- Open space could be incorporated in scheme

**Council Response:**
- The proposed development falls within the Malpas Ward that has a shortfall in Formal Play of 8.51Ha and Equipped Play of 2.34Ha. Owing to the distance from the nearest play facility 800m it is proposed that a LAP/LEAP would be provided to meet the immediate needs of the local young people with off-site contributions for formal play provision.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**

**Representation Text:**
- By providing links within scheme

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

**Representation Text:**
- Very short distance on Malpas Road

**Council Response:**
- malpas rd . Adjacent to site boundary

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

**Representation Text:**
- Not known

**Council Response:**
- 6- 10 mins

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

**Representation Text:**
- 3 Kilometres

**Council Response:**
- newport 4.7km
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2076.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development on Sneyd Lodge/Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

**Representation Text:**
- 400m
- 6-8 shops - Parc-y-Prior

**Council Response:**
- malpas rd. tesco 1200m, chip shop 1100m, garage malpas rd 400m, almond drive shops 550m. School 430m

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

**Representation Text:**
- Bus routes provide accessibility to jobs and city centre. Schools and local community services in Malpas accessible by foot.

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

**Representation Text:**
- By integration with local provision

**Council Response:**
- footways malpas rd

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

**Representation Text:**
- No

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

**Representation Text:**
- Approx 500m in Malpas Court

**Council Response:**
- Informal open space can be located at North of Oliphan Circle and Trevithick, Malpas

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

**Representation Text:**
- Yes. Immediately adjoining at Malpas court and nearby at Parc-y-Prior

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

**Representation Text:**
- No

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

**Representation Text:**
- By provision of Housing numbers in a discreet and sustainable location

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

**Representation Text:**
- No

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

**Representation Text:**
- Immediately adjoining

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**
### Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

**Representation Text:** Yes.

**Council Response:**

WELSH WATER COMMENTS

**Sewerage**

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site-specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

**Water supply**

It is unlikely that our existing water supply network can supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works will be required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

**Sewage treatment**

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments toward the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

**Nash Waste Water Treatment Works**

Newport is served by our Nash Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Logical Extension?</td>
<td>Immediately adjoins built-up area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Precedent Setting?</td>
<td>Would do neither. This is a logical rounding off site between built-up area and Rougemont School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Site Owner?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Restrictive Covenants?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Realistic Timescale?</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Development Boundary Change?</td>
<td>Yes. Green wedge needs to be redrawn locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Planning Application Refusals?</td>
<td>Yes. Only for house extension 07/1371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?

**Representation Text:**

No.

### Question: 8 Other Information?

**Representation Text:**

This particular area of the green wedge has very limited width because of its proximity to the Torfaen Boundary. Immediately adjoining to the north are the extensive recently developed school grounds of Rougemont.

The school location is clearly because of its proximity to the Malpas built-up area and Torfaen's decision to allow its major expansion are clearly because of the perception that it is part of the built up area.

### Question: 9 Map Included?

**Representation Text:**

Yes.
Question: SA Recommendation

Council Response: C2 in part of site: it is recommended that this part of the site is not developed and that green infrastructure is provided within the site to include SUDS.

Communication to be created to avoid potential harm to these sites.

SPC designated areas: close to SSSI: buffer areas should be created to avoid potential harm to these sites.

Primary facilities community hall and open space (inc. "various community facilities" unspecified) to be provided as part of development- suggest some employment is also provided as part of the development (this could be in the form of live/work units).

Scheduled Ancient Monument: borders ASA: buffer areas free from development should be created if appropriate to retain the integrity and value of archaeological assets.

May harm potential of tourism assets including historical and environmental features: it should be ensured that the potential of the area of tourism development is investigated and realised onsite.

Question: Overall Council Response

Council Response: This land is close to but divorced from the main settlement of Langstone. Also, this part of Magor road is more rural in character than the land to the north and it is not appropriate to be included as part of the urban form of Newport. It is not considered to be of the same urban fabric as the land and houses up Magor Road to the north. Also there are SINC allocations in this vacinity.

As to whether this land is needed for the Newport housing supply the Council would contend that it is not.

The plan seeks to promote the reuse of brownfield sites in preference to extensive use of greenfield sites as this generally performs better in sustainability terms for a variety of reasons. As well as protecting the countryside, this will help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by car, and make best use of existing infrastructure, both physical and social, helping to maintain existing communities.

The forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of Welsh Government projections, the regional context and current market realities. The plan allocates more than sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation site for housing would be contrary to the Council’s strategy of accommodating growth in Newport within the urban area and within the defined Eastern Expansion Area as part of a comprehensive sustainable development. The Council’s strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8.

It is recommended that this site is not included in the Local Development Plan for development.

Question: Site Name

Representation Text: Woodlands

Question: Location

Representation Text: Woodlands, Magor Road, Langstone, NP182JX

Question: Grid Reference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2077.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Candidate site for residential development of one unit on Woodlands, Magor Road.

**Question: 2.4 Site Area**
- **Representation Text:**
- **Council Response:** 0.24ha

**Question: 2.5 Brief Description**
- **Representation Text:** Old tennis court & stables
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 2.6 Current Use**
- **Representation Text:** Tennis delapidated
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)**
- **Representation Text:** Construct one house
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 3.1 Brownfield?**
- **Representation Text:** As above. Delapitated eye sore
- **Council Response:** The site is greenfield

**Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?**
- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**
- **Representation Text:** It would enhance the landsape by replacing old stables & tennis court. with a new property to match existing properties.
- **Council Response:** Countryside Comments: Open Countryside so broad countryside issues. Site specifics would have to be considered, trees visual impact ecology etc

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**
- **Representation Text:** No.
- **Council Response:** Trees with TPO potential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2077.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development of one unit on Woodlands, Magor Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

- Representation Text: It would get rid of the old tennis court & stables, which are eye sores.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

- Representation Text: 

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

- Representation Text:  
  - Council Response: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: None known. No reason for not allocating LDP.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

- Representation Text:  
  - Council Response: The site is greenfield

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

- Representation Text:  

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

- Representation Text:  

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**

- Representation Text:  

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**

- Representation Text:  

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**

- Representation Text:  

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**

- Representation Text:  
  - Council Response: Listed building n/a

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**

- Representation Text:  
  - Council Response: Listed building n/a
### Newport City Council Local Development Plan

**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2077.C1</td>
<td>11/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development of one unit on Woodlands, Magor Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Access to Highway?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>yes via private lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Open Space Linkage Improvement?</td>
<td>We will remove part of old delapidated tennis court &amp; old stables. Which are an eye sore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td>The proposed development falls within the Langstone Ward that has a shortfall in play space of 5.37Ha. Owing to the small size of the site an off-site contribution for outdoor play facilites locally will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Bus Route?</td>
<td>100 metres total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>80 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Bus Frequency?</td>
<td>Every 1/2 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>20-30 mins freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Railway Station?</td>
<td>5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>newport station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Convenience Shop?</td>
<td>3 shops within 1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation Text:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response:</td>
<td>800m to garage shop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Poly</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2077.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P P W M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development of one unit on Woodlands, Magor Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- **Representation Text:** Very good
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

- **Representation Text:**
- **Council Response:** on site provision

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- **Representation Text:**
- **Council Response:** The site has no formal, informal or equipped open space in close proximity

**Question: 5.1 Schools?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. W. I of Langstone Langstone Ladies Group School etc.

**Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. Neighbours & Farm next door. We have written agreements, if you require them.

**Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?**

- **Representation Text:** It would remove old stables & tennis court

**Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?**

- **Representation Text:** Adjacent

**Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

**Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=C; not submitted Late

Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary

2077.C1 11/05/2009 P P W M Summary: Candidate site for residential development of one unit on Woodlands, Magor Road

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

Given the size of the proposed development and likely density of units it is likely that the proposed flows generated by development would overload the public sewerage system. In order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will be required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determined appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our existing distribution main and Priory Wood pumping station could supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the proposed additional development and to maintain the service level of our existing customers. In order to understand the required works a modelling assessment would need to be undertaken subject to provision of further detail as to the proposed site usage.

Sewerage treatment

These sites will drain to our Nash waste water treatment works, please see our comments towards the end of our letter with respect to this treatment works.

Nash Waste Water Treatment Works

Newport is served by our Nash Waster Water Treatment Works (WwTW). This WwTW, located near the village of Nash, also serves parts of Monmouthshire along the coast from Newport, including the towns of Chepstow, Caldicot and Magor. The WwTW will ultimately be unable to accommodate all of the currently identified candidate sites, without further improvements being undertaken.

We would advise that there is an improvement scheme planned for completion by 1st April 2013, subject to approval of the necessary funding. This scheme has been planned to accommodate an expected level of growth to 2016 based on past trends. Following completion of this scheme, the works should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the initial part of your development plan. However, further upgrades will be required to accommodate the full development plan proposed for the later stages of the plan. We will review capacity at Nash against Local Development Plan aims and may submit a proposal to Ofwat in our next Periodic Review in 2014 for a further extension at Nash in the period 2015-2020.

Should any larger developments look to communicate with the public sewerage system in the shorter term, it could be the case that we can look at funding to be provided by the developers to extend the works to cater for their developments. This is something we would look to do in conjunction with the developer and the planning department via the appropriate methods. This can be discussed at a later stage when more information relating to the phasing and housing numbers is available.

In addition to the above comments, we would note that some proposed sites may be crossed by existing Public sewers and/or Water mains. Prior to developing any site, all developers should contact this office to discuss any requirements we have.

Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

16/02/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2077.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development of one unit on Woodlands, Magor Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text:**

It would get rid of the old tennis court & stables

**Council Response:**

The site is near but not directly adjacent to the settlement boundary

---

**Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?**

**Representation Text:**

Total of houses here 4. and there is no no land to build. except ours. Farmers fields behind us

---

**Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

---

**Question: 7.2 Site Owner?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes.

---

**Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. We have a paddock marked in black biro on enclosed plan. Your records will show you refused planning permission to paddock some years ago.

---

**Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?**

**Representation Text:**

No.

---

**Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?**

**Representation Text:**

Yes. 1-3 years

---

**Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?**

**Representation Text:**

The site is currently allocated as Countryside

---

**Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?**

**Representation Text:**

ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS 97/0786 22/10/1997 REFUSED

**Council Response:**

ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS 97/0786 22/10/1997 REFUSED

---

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:**

yes on our paddock

---

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:**

.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2077.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for residential development of one unit on Woodlands, Magor Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

*Representation Text:*

---

**Question: 9 Map Included?**

*Representation Text: Yes.*
### Summary
Candidate site for outdoor sport and play space on land at Traston Road

#### Site: 137/ Traston Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.1 Site Name</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: Traston Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.2 Location</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: Land opposite, Newport International Sports Village, Traston Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.3 Grid Reference</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: 333739 186040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: 333790 185970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.4 Site Area</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: 12.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: 12.99ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.5 Brief Description</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: The access road (Traston Rd) no longer allows vehicular traffic to travel completely through either from the industrial or housing end. The site is level agricultural/pastures land with interconnection land drain system. There are high voltage pylons crossing the site and the small wooded area to the west end of the site was once a works sports ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.6 Current Use</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: Agricultural/pastures land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 2.7 Proposed Use(s)</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: Outdoor Sport and Play Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.1 Brownfield?</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: No. Although part of the proposed site was once a works sports ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question: 3.10 Minerals Safeguarding Area?</strong></td>
<td>Representation Text: Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Response: The site is not within a mineral safeguarding area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2095.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.11 Agricultural Land?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. The last land classification was (ED1) Employment Land Allocation

**Question: 3.12 Landscape Quality and Visual Intrusion?**

- **Representation Text:** The proposed use of land would have very little visual impact on the landscape. The layout of sports pitches provision would be restricted by the overhead power lines so it is likely that there will be a large area that remains the same. The seasonal provision of football and rugby posts coupled with walkways/access is all that are envisaged for the site should it be developed.

- **Council Response:** Countryside Comments: Open Countryside so broad countryside issues. Site specifics would have to be considered, trees visual impact ecology etc

**Question: 3.13 Trees and Hedgerows?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. There are mature trees and hedge rows but it is unknown if they are protected.

- **Council Response:** TPO 06/2006 mixed deciduous woodland
  TPO 2/2006 and a SINC

**Question: 3.14 Biodiversity and Landscape Features?**

- **Representation Text:** The proposed classification of the site would retain and complement any biodiversity or landscape features.

**Question: 3.15 Green Space and Corridor Enhancement?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.16 Archaeology?**

- **Representation Text:** No.

- **Council Response:** Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust comment: On Gwent Levels, Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Fairly Significant Restraint. Will need archaeological evaluation prior to planning permission being granted. Allocation could be included in LDP but subject to results of archaeological evaluation.

**Question: 3.2 Greenfield?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.

**Question: 3.3 Contaminated Land Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** Not Known

**Question: 3.4 Flood Risk?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes. N/A

- **Council Response:** The site is within zone C1 flood risk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2095.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for outdoor sport and play space on land at Traston Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 3.5 Adjacent to Water Course?**  
Representation Text: No. However, there is a complex mix of drains inside and outside of the site.

**Question: 3.6 Topography / Stability Problems?**  
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 3.7 SSSI?**  
Representation Text: No. The site is on the fringe of Nash and Goldcliff SSSI

Council Response: SINC Solutia Site

**Question: 3.8 Protected Species?**  
Representation Text: Owing to the nature of the existing use it likely that there are some protected species living within the site outlined. No studies have been undertake as part of this submission to ascertain what if any may exist, however the type of use that this submission proposes would not have any significant impact.

**Question: 3.9 Conservation Area or Listed Building?**  
Representation Text: No.

**Question: 4.1 Access to Highway?**  
Representation Text: Yes. It is envisaged that any additional traffic for formal play use (football/rugby matches) would be directed through Newport International Sports Village where there is car parking and changing facilities. Other access to this site would be through the Reevesland Industrial Estate.

Access from NISV acceptable

**Question: 4.10 Open Space Linkage Improvement?**  
Representation Text: The site itself would be an open space although classified as Outdoor Sport and Play Space

Council Response: Newport has a shortfall in formal play space of 20.66Ha based on the population in 2001. Owing to the size of sports pitches/formal play provision they cannot be accommodated on every development, therefore a strategic view has to be taken with regards to their location. Consequently the expansion of existing formal play facilities at strategic locations seems logical as much of the infrastructure is in place to accommodate the proposed facilities i.e. changing facilities parking etc, although it is likely that additional changing facilities would be required at this location. The proposed site is easily accessed by road, cycle, foot and public transport and is on the eastern side of the City which is likely to see the greatest increase in population over the next 20 years.

**Question: 4.11 Public Transport Connectivity Improvement?**  
Representation Text: N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2095.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for outdoor sport and play space on land at Traston Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: 4.2 Bus Route?**

- **Representation Text:** 650 meters
- **Council Response:** Nash rd. 350 m, Southeren Distributor Road - 700 m

**Question: 4.3 Bus Frequency?**

- **Representation Text:** Every 2 hours
- **Council Response:** 10-20 min frequency

**Question: 4.4 Railway Station?**

- **Representation Text:** City Centre
- **Council Response:** newport station

**Question: 4.5 Convenience Shop?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A
- **Council Response:** Nash rd. 400 metres, general store, Aldi Nash rd - 600 metres

**Question: 4.6 Jobs & Community Services Accessibility?**

- **Representation Text:** N/A
- **Council Response:**

**Question: 4.7 Walking and Cycling?**

- **Representation Text:** The proposed future use of this land would enhance physical activity amongst the citizens of Newport. Cycling and walking routes currently existing within close proximity of this site.
- **Council Response:** The site is not affected by the national cycle route

**Question: 4.8 Public Rights of Way?**

- **Representation Text:** Yes.
- **Council Response:** PROW 395/1 395/15

**Question: 4.9 Open Space?**

- **Representation Text:** 20 Meters
- **Council Response:** The closest formal and equipped open space can be located at Spytty Park
Question: 5.1 Schools?

Representation Text: Yes. Opposite the site Newport International Sports Village and at the end of Traston Road is Lliswerry Comprehensive School.

Question: 5.2 Community Engagement?

Representation Text: No.

Question: 5.3 Community Aspirations?

Representation Text: It is likely that community will be extremely pleased with proposed new classification for the use for this land. There are concerns with regards to flooding in the area by local residents, maintaining a what is currently a green space will allay any fears.

Question: 5.4 Loss of Recreational Facilities?

Representation Text: No. The purpose of this submission is to plan for future expansion/need of play and sports facilities.

Question: 6.1 Infrastructure Proximity?

Representation Text: It is proposed that changing facilities for this site will be via those that currently exist within Newport International Sports Village. However should the need arise to provide a sports pavilion on site most of the services mentioned are within 100 meters although the exact distance is not known.

Question: 6.2 Neighbouring Development Issues?

Representation Text: No. The peak use of this site would not conflict with any rush hour or shift work patterns consequently there should be no traffic impact. With regards to existing use.

Question: 6.3 Infrastructure Capacity?

Representation Text: Yes. It is proposed that changing facilities for this site will be via those that currently exist within Newport International Sports Village. However should the need arise to provide a sports pavilion on site most of the services mentioned are within 100 meters although the exact distance is not known. The existing road and pathway network is sufficient for the proposed use.

Council Response: Welsh Water Comments

Sewerage

From the information provided it is difficult to clarify if the public sewerage system can accommodate the proposed level of development. Should the density of each development be considerably high there is a possibility that some of the development may overload the existing sewerage system. As such, in order to accommodate the sewerage generated by the development it is likely that off site works will required to provide sufficient capacity and ensure that there is no detriment to the environment and existing customers. A hydraulic modelling assessment would usually be required to understand the impact of any proposed development so that the likely scope of off site works can be determine appropriately.

Subject to consultation on individual sites including further information, such as the likely density, we may be able to provide more informative site specific comments. In this instance we may also be in a position to advise that certain smaller developments could be accommodated with the public sewerage system.

Water Supply

It is unlikely that our Ladyhill service reservoir has the required capacity to supply the proposed additional development. As such it is likely that off site works are required to ensure an
### Question: 6.4 Employment, Waste or Mineral Uses on or Adjoining?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 6.5 Logical Extension?

**Representation Text:** Newport International Sports Village is located opposite this site (approximately 10meters). The proposed classification of this land and any subsequent development would be a logical extension to the existing provision.

**Council Response:** The site is within the settlement boundary

### Question: 6.6 Precedent Setting?

**Representation Text:** 

### Question: 7.1 Site Owned by Proposer?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.2 Site Owner?

**Representation Text:** No.

### Question: 7.3 Interest in Adjoining Land?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Newport International Sports Village

### Question: 7.4 Restrictive Covenants?

**Representation Text:** No Known

### Question: 7.5 Realistic Timescale?

**Representation Text:** Yes. Although it is likely to be 4-6 years

### Question: 7.6 Development Boundary Change?

**Representation Text:** It is proposed to change the classification from 'Employment land Allocation' to 'Outdoor Sport and Play Space'

**Council Response:** The site is currently allocated as Employment land, and transport development area and Eastern Expansion Area within the UDP

### Question: 7.7 Unimplemented Planning Permissions?

**Representation Text:** Not known
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2095.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Candidate site for outdoor sport and play space on land at Traston Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Response:**

06/1053 05/10/2006 Granted with conditions

- **HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION:** No objection.
- **HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE:** No comment to make.
- **GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST:** No objection.
- **ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:** No objection.
- **NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE:** No objection.
- **WELSH ASSEMBLY GOVERNMENT HIGHWAYS:** No objection.

- **ERECTION OF STEEL COIL COATING FACTORY, ASSOCIATED OFFICES AND PARKING**
  07/0045 07/11/2007 Granted with conditions
  
  - **HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION:** No objection subject to conditions requiring the submission of a Travel Plan and an amended parking layout showing the provision of a minimum of 49 parking spaces including 3 disabled spaces. Also requires a financial contribution of £50,000 towards enhancing the cycle network improvement scheme within the area to mitigate against the increased traffic.
  - **HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES:** No objection subject to contamination conditions.
  - **POLICE ARCHITECTURAL LIAISON OFFICER:** No objection subject to standard advice.
  - **CALDICOT AND WENTLOOGE LEVELS INLAND DRAINAGE BOARD:** No objection.
  - **DWR CYMRU – WELSH WATER:** No objection.
  - **WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION:** No objection.
  - **WALES AND WEST UTILITIES:** No objection.
  - **GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST:** No objection subject to conditions.
  - **ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:** No objection subject to conditions.

- **DEVELOPMENT OF A NETWORK RAIL DEPOT CONSISTING OF TWO SINGLE STOREY BUILDINGS TO BE USED AS STAFF AND OFFICE ACCOMMODATION WITH ASSOCIATED STORAGE/PARKING**
  07/1315 23/04/2008 Granted with conditions
  
  - **HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION:** A parking layout showing a minimum of 44 staff parking areas, turning area and parking for HGV’s is required. Requires that condition 1 is attached to any permission granted to ensure that details of an alternative route, other than through the college/residential area of Nash Road, are provided for heavy goods vehicles. Details submitted regarding the reinstatement of the infilled watercourses are considered acceptable. Only temporary permission shall be issued. Full permission will require a formal Transport Assessment.
  - **HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (CONTAMINATED LAND):** Requests the contaminated land conditions be attached to any planning permission granted.
  - **HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (BIODIVERSITY):** No information has been provided on how the proposed reen widening and new reen construction will be undertaken to minimise impacts on wildlife and their maintenance in long term. Cross sections of the proposed new reens and reen widening are also required. Larger areas of tree scrub planting are required, particularly along the western side of the site, to compensate for the loss of the large area of tree and scrub removed. Further details are required with regards to the ground conditions, which can influence the wildflower seed mixture. The send mixture also needs to reflect adjacent similar vegetation. The proposed finished levels and contours are not shown. A more detailed management plan will need to be submitted for a period of 5-10 years and needs to show areas where management activities are to be undertaken. Furthermore, ecological monitoring of the reens and other new habitats will need to be undertaken for a period no less than 5 years.
  - **HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (WOODLANDS):** Opposed to removal of TPO’d Willow pollards which line the reen along Nash Road.
  - **HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (LANDSCAPE):** No response.
  - **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** Supports application. The rural character of the area must be maintained through strong landscaping.
  - **CALDICOT AND WENTLOOGE LEVELS INLAND DRAINAGE BOARD:** Land Drainage Consent shall be sought prior to modification, culverting or infilling of any ditches/reens/watercourses. Consents shall also be gained for any proposals, which are likely to increase surface water run-off. There shall be no loss of capacity or connectivity in the reen system and the construction of storage lagoons/tanks shall be allowed for to limit surface water discharges to Greenfield rates.
  - **COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES:** The proposed development is not likely to damage the features of the SSSI providing that appropriate conditions are applied. Measures need to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2095.C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate site for outdoor sport and play space on land at Traston Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

be taken to ensure that polluted water does not discharge into the SSSI. Slag material shall be removed from buffer zones and from the areas proposed for reen widen in works, to prevent contamination of the watercourses.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: The Flood Consequence Assessment submitted demonstrated that the risks can be acceptably managed. No objections in principle but make a number of recommendations with regard to the design of the proposals submitted. The south-west corner of the site shall be made into a wetland area to compensate for the previous loss of habitat on site. This requires amendments to the currently proposed landscaping plan. The profile of the reens should be altered to encompass a shelf to benefit marginal plant species and other flora and fauna. Further information will be required regarding the planting of the reens and current information is insufficient. The findings of the FCA shall be incorporated into any planning permission granted. It is recommended that conditions be attached to any permission granted to prevent pollution of the water environment. Further to this details will need to be submitted regarding the drainage and the potential impacts of activities on site on the adjacent watercourses and/or groundwater.

GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: A programme of archaeological work shall be secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to identify any features of archaeological interest discovered through the process of widening and creation of reens.

GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: Full contaminated land conditions should be attached to any permission granted. Recommend a number of improvements to the landscape design and management plan including: a stepped reen profile to promote burrowing opportunities; greater variety of backside vegetation; pesticides, composts and fertilisers shall not be used to treat the reens and any weeds should be removed by hand; weed control is only required in wildflower areas and other areas should be allowed to seed naturally, the site shouldn’t be treated with compost and seeds should be sown on raked soil which is lightly rolled.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE: Do not advise against application.

NETWORK RAIL: No objections.

DWR CYMRU-WELSH WATER: Advise that conditions are attached to any planning permission granted to ensure that there is no detriment to existing residents or the environment and to Dwr Cymru Welsh Water’s assets.

WALES AND WEST UTILITIES: Advise of apparatus in area.

WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION: Advise of apparatus in area and safe working practices.

Biotreatment Plant to Treat Effluent Wastewater from Two Process Plants Comprising 3 Balance Tanks and Bioreactor

08/02/2008 28/05/2008 Granted with conditions

HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: No objection, recommend a condition requiring the provision of a wheel wash facility on site during construction.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH): Requires confirmation of noise levels quoted for the 6 blowers, full details and calculations demonstrating the noise attenuation stated and further information regarding the Carbon Dioxide and Ammonia emissions.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (CONTAMINATED LAND): No objection.

GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: No comment.

WELSH ASSEMBLY GOVERNMENT (TRANSPORT WALES): No objection.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE: The HSE does not advise against the approval of this application.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: No objection, recommend a condition regarding the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals. Given the scale of development, a Flood Consequence Assessment is not required. The proposal has been discussed and agreed by the Environment Agency through pre application discussions.

GLAMORGAN GWENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRUST: No objection.

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: No objection on the basis that the proposals will improve the quality of effluent currently discharged into the River Severn

Erection of 2 No. Wind Turbines, Access Tracks, Temporary Construction Compound, Switchgear House, Hardstanding Area and Cabling (Amendment to Permission 06/1466)

08/14/2009 19/01/2009 Granted with conditions

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH): Advise that conditions be attached regarding the possible contamination of the land. No objection regarding the noise report submitted.

HEAD OF PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (BIODIVERSITY): No response.

HEAD OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION: No objection.

COUNTRYSIDE COUNCIL FOR WALES: No objection.

SOUTH WALES TRUNK ROAD AGENCY: No response.

ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF BIRDS: No response.

GWENT WILDLIFE TRUST: No response.
### ERECTION OF 2NO. WIND TURBINES, MONITORING MAST AND ACCESS TRACKS

**Question: 7.8 Planning Application Refusals?**

**Representation Text:** Not Known

**Question: 7.9 Planning Applications Pending?**

**Representation Text:** Not known

**Question: 8 Other Information?**

**Representation Text:** Policy Context

The Welsh Assembly sees young people’s recreational needs as a priority as it is a mechanism that can improve the levels of physical activity whether accessing facilities in or outside of school. The Assembly Government recognises the critical importance of play for the development of children’s physical, social, mental, emotional and creative skills. The Welsh Assembly’s ‘Play Policy’ (October 2002) together with the ‘Play Policy Implementation Plan’ (February 2006), aims to help create an environment which fosters children’s play and underpins a national strategy to provide for their play needs. The Assembly Government is committed to ensuring that all children have access to rich, stimulating environments in which to play freely. The Assembly recognises that play is integral to the health and well-being of children and young people, founded on the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.
The Welsh Assembly Government also recognises that sport and recreation contribute to our quality of life and supports the development of sport and recreation and the wide range of leisure pursuits which encourage physical activity. Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) outlines the role of the planning system in ensuring that adequate provision is made for recreational space to meet the community’s need for both organised sport and informal activities. More specifically, paragraphs 11.1.9 of the guidance states:

"The planning system should ensure that adequate land and water resources are allocated for formal and informal sport and recreation, taking full account of the need for recreational space and current levels of provision and deficiencies, and the impact on the location."

PPW requires local planning authorities to provide a framework for well-located sport, recreation and leisure facilities which should be sensitive to the needs of users, attractive, well designed, well maintained, safe and accessible to all. PPW does not prescribe particular standards of provision. Instead, these should be based on the results of the Open Space Assessment process. A well-conceived strategy will seek to improve the match between current levels of provision and existing and likely patterns of demand.

The Welsh Assembly Government Strategy for Sport and Physical Activity ‘Climbing Higher’ (January 2005) sets out the long-term strategy for sport and physical activity in Wales for the next twenty years. The purpose of the strategy is to achieve:

• An active, healthy and inclusive Wales, where sport, physical activity and active recreation provide a common platform for participation, fun and achievement, which binds communities and the nation and where the outstanding environment of Wales is used sustainably to enhance confidence in ourselves and our place in the world.

• ‘Climbing Higher’ has spatial land use planning implications at national and local levels. It includes targets, in particular that by 2025:

• No-one should live more than a 6 minute walk (300 metres) from their nearest natural green space.

By encouraging healthier lifestyles, the Assembly Government hopes to improve the health and well-being of people in Wales, including older people, those with disabilities, children and young people. It aims to address health inequalities by encouraging everyone to adopt healthier lifestyles and ensuring access to local services, including the encouragement of cycling and walking.

The Local Development Plan should set out the strategic vision for the authority with regard to providing, protecting and enhancing facilities for sport, physical activity, open space and recreation. Plans should consider the scale and distribution of facilities and activities when allocating sites for open space and recreational use.

Outdoor Sport and Play Space (Open Space) Assessment

Outdoor Sport and Playing Space refers to land and facilities use where sport and play are the primary purpose. It also contributes importantly in terms of informal recreation, amenity, and biodiversity.

Examples of formal play are; Football/Rugby pitches, tennis courts, bowling greens, multi-use games areas.

Examples of informal play are; grassed areas and youth shelters.

Description of Equipped/designated play is; areas for children’s play containing a range of facilities and an environment designed to provide focused opportunities for outdoor play, including play areas and playgrounds of all kinds.

The draft Outdoor Sport and Play Space Assessment shown below shows that Newport has a surplus of ‘informal play space’ which is mainly due to the poor topography in certain areas of the City and very few of these sites could be used for formal play without significant investment and change in the natural landscape.
Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n/Para/Policy</th>
<th>AccessnNo</th>
<th>DateLodgd</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Modified</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2095.C1</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representations & Council Responses juxtaposed

Rep’n/Para/Policy AccessnNo DateLodgd Late? Source Type Mode Status Status Modified Summary

---

Informal Category Summary117.03137,01162.7654.27
Equipped Category Summary3.71137,01137.65-33.94
NEWPORT Overall306.33137,011301.235.09

The assessment shows that there is currently a significant shortfall in formal play space of 15.24Ha. The existing demand for this type of space is currently being unmet during peak periods and the future housing developments across the City will increase the demand further.

Based on the major candidate sites submitted as part of the LDP process for Newport and making assumptions that a significant amount of these will not become housing developments it is still estimated that an additional 26.88Ha of formal play space will be required in the future based Fields In Trust (FIT) benchmark standard. When deducting facilities already identified within in future developments across the City there is still a shortfall of 21.8Ha which equates to 24 football/Rugby pitches.

It is acknowledged that large developments should be more sustainable and provide sports pitches, which is the case for both the Lanwern Village and Steel Works Development although the total provided is likely to fall short of the FIT benchmark.

The Location

Formal play facilities can be found across the City with some significant venues located in the west at Tredegar Park (22.68Ha) and the northcentral at the Glebelands (26.72Ha). Newport International Sports Village located in the south/east of the City has a significant amount of indoor facilities in addition to 14.92Ha of formal space and it is proposed as part of this submission to increase the formal play provision by 12.86Ha making a total of 27.78Ha.

Having large formal play facilities located strategically across the City contribute to sustainable development allowing citizens easy local access to facilities within their part of the City. It envisaged that the existing changing facilities located within Sports Village would be sufficient to meet the immediate need once the provision was developed.

Newport International Sport Village is approximately two miles from junction 24 of the M4 Motorway and is adjacent to the A48 (recently designated). The A48 forms part of the new Southern Distributor Road with the road beginning at Junction 24 of the M4 Motorway and extend through A48 Pont Ebbw roundabout, to junction 28 of the M4.

The car park located nearest to the proposed site has 186 car parking spaces, 8 accessible parking spaces, 4 coach parking bays and 2 drop off points.

Newport Transport busses that travel past the Northern perimeter of the site via the A48, the services are; 9, 16, 16A, 96, (5A-C). The walk from the bus stops on the A48 to the facility will take approximately 10 minutes.

As with the bus routes above, Newport International Sports Village is supported with good walking routes as part of the local highway infrastructure. The main access by foot is likely to be from the A48/Corporation Road and A48/Nash Road areas. The A48/Corporation Road has crossing points at this junction and the A48/Nash Road has a footbridge that crosses this busy highway.

There are two access points onto the site from the A48. The main entrance way is off Langland Way and allows access by foot, with additional access points on Traston Lane and Nash Road. In addition the Sports Village is easily accessed from both National Cycle Routes 4 and 47 through links provided by local cycle routes Traston Road is located immediately to the south east of the site, thereby offering excellent links. This route then connects to National Cycle Route 4 – The Celtic Trail. Alternatively another local cycle route follows the route of the A48 around the northern boundary of the sports village, which then links with National Cycle Route 47.

The strategic location for the provision of formal play has to consider the topography of the land. The proposed site is in the main level and the use would not significantly impact upon land visually or cause any disruption of the local drainage system. There are very few, if any, areas of land located on the edge of the City with such topography and providing a strategic location for the communities located within the southeast of the City.

Question: 9 Map Included?

Representation Text: Yes. See attached
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Appendix 2 – Candidate Site Criteria
CANDIDATE SITES FORM  
NEWPORT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
2011 - 2026

Use this form to submit details of sites for consideration in the Newport Local Development Plan 2011 - 2026

This form must be returned by **5pm on Wednesday 6 May 2009**

By post to: Planning Policy
Newport City Council
Civic Centre
Newport
South Wales
NP20 4UR

Or email to: **ldp.consultation@newport.gov.uk** (an editable version in Word is available on request)

Alternatively, this form may be filled in interactively at: [www.newport.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.newport.gov.uk/planningpolicy)

Please note that representations cannot be treated as confidential.

A separate form should be completed for each site. A site plan should also be included.

This form may be copied. Please provide as much information as you can. Guidance notes are on the back page.

### 1 Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>....................................................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representer Number</td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shown in brackets on your address label)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel</td>
<td>........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>........................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agent details if used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>....................................................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel</td>
<td>........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>........................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2 Basic Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(street name, postcode or other identification)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Ordnance Survey Grid Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>Site Area (Hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>Brief Description, including topography and significant features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>Current use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.7</th>
<th>Proposed use(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3 Environmental Issues

(Grey boxes should not be filled in)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qu No</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Is the site previously developed land?(^1) If so, what was the previous use(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Is the site Greenfield?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Is there a risk that the land is contaminated? If so what is the potential contamination and source of it, and how would it be dealt with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Is the site in a flood risk area? If so, what is the development advice zone (see TAN15(^2)) and how would the issue be addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Is the site adjacent to a water course?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) For a definition of previously developed land, see Figure 2.1 page 24 Planning Policy Wales, available at: [www.wales.gov.uk/desh/publications/planning/ppw/ppw2002e.pdf?lang=en](http://www.wales.gov.uk/desh/publications/planning/ppw/ppw2002e.pdf?lang=en)

| 3.6 | Does the site's topography or stability present any problems to its development? If so, give details. |
| 3.7 | Is the site subject to any environmental protection designations (eg a Site of Special Scientific Interest)? If so, give details, including of any nearby sites. |
| 3.8 | Is it likely that there are any protected species on or near the site? If so, give details. |
| 3.9 | Does the site include a Conservation Area or a Listed Building? If so, give details. |
| 3.10 | Is the site in a potential minerals safeguarding area (eg for sand and gravel or limestone)? If so, give details. |
| 3.11 | Is the site in agricultural use, or was that its last use? If so, what is its Agricultural Land Classification? |
| 3.12 | How would you describe the quality of the local landscape or environment, and how intrusive would development be within it, and from where would it be visible? |
| 3.13 | Are there mature trees or hedgerows on the site? If so, are they protected? |

---

3 SSSIs and some other environmental designations are shown in the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan, available at: [www.newport.gov.uk/ _dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=planning.udp](http://www.newport.gov.uk/_dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=planning.udp)


Or see the South East Wales Biological Records Centre (SEWBReC) at: [www.sewbrec.org.uk](http://www.sewbrec.org.uk) (charges may be made for data).

5 Conservation Areas are shown on the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan available at: [www.newport.gov.uk/ _dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=planning.udp](http://www.newport.gov.uk/_dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=planning.udp)
3.14 In what ways could development of the site retain and/or enhance biodiversity or landscape features within or near the site?

3.15 Does the site present an opportunity for the maintenance and enhancement of green spaces and corridors throughout the urban area including river corridors?

3.16 Is there an archaeological site in or in the vicinity of the proposed site? If so, give details.

4 Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qu No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Is the site accessible from the public highway? If so, is the highway capable of supporting the level of traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>How far is it to the nearest bus route?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>What is the typical daytime frequency of buses per hour on that route?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>How far is it to the nearest railway station?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>How far is it to the nearest convenience shop? How many shops are there at that location?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Required information can be sought from the Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust; Email planning@ggat.org.uk or Tel 01792 634223 (charges may be made for data).
### 4.6 How accessible is the site to jobs and community services?

### 4.7 How would walking and cycling be encouraged by this development?

### 4.8 Are there any public rights of way on or adjoining the site? If so, please mark on the site plan.

### 4.9 How far is it to the nearest area of usable open space?

### 4.10 In what ways would development of this site improve links to open space?

### 4.11 In what ways would development of this site help to improve connectivity to public transport?

### 5 Community Issues

Please tick Yes or No where appropriate, and provide any further information requested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qu No:</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Further Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Are there any schools or other community facilities in the area? If so, what and where?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Has development of this site been discussed with the community? If so, please give details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>How could community aspirations be met in the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Would development of this site result in the loss of any facilities, such as playgrounds, sports grounds of allotments? If so, give details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Infrastructure and Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Further Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 How far is the site from existing water, sewerage, electricity, gas and telecommunications services?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Is the proposed use likely to give rise to any issues relating to the nature of adjacent uses (eg with regard to noise, smells, dust, traffic etc)? If so, what are the issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Does sufficient infrastructure capacity exist to ensure the implementation of the development (including water supplies, sewerage and associated waste management facilities)? If no capacity exists, how will suitable provision be secured?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Are employment, waste or mineral uses involved, either as proposed or adjoining uses? If so, what will be the distance between these uses and residential properties?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 In what ways would development of this site be a logical extension to existing development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 In what ways would development of this site add to pressures, or provide opportunities, for other sites nearby to be developed or redeveloped?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7  Land Ownership and Development Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qu No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Further Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Is the site wholly in the ownership of the proposer? If not, have all other owners been notified of this submission?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Are you the owner of the site? If not, what is your interest in the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Do you have an interest in any adjoining or nearby land? If so, please indicate the boundary in blue on your plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Do any restrictive covenants apply to the land or buildings? If so, please give details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Does the land have a realistic possibility of coming forward for development within the LDP period (2011 – 2026)? If so, would you expect a start on site to be within 1-3 years, 4-6 years, or 7+ years of the start of the LDP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Would the allocation of this land require a change to a boundary or designation in the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996 – 2011? If so, what would need to be changed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Are there any unimplemented planning permissions on the site? If so, please give application numbers and details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 The UDP can be viewed at: [www.newport.gov.uk/_dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=planning udp](http://www.newport.gov.uk/_dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=planning udp)
| 7.8 | Have any planning applications been refused on the site since 1 January 2004? If so, please give application numbers and details. |
| 7.9 | Are there any planning applications on the site which are not yet determined? If so, please give application numbers and details. |

### 8 Other Information

Please add any other information relevant to the proposed development of the site.

### 9 Map

Please include an Ordnance Survey based site plan, with the scale defined, with the candidate site edged in red, and any other nearby or adjoining land in your ownership edged in blue.
Thank you for completing this form.

The form must be returned by **5pm on Wednesday 6 May 2009**

By post to: Planning Policy
            Newport City Council
            Civic Centre
            Newport
            South Wales
            NP20 4UR

Or email to:  **ldp.consultation@newport.gov.uk**
A Candidate Site is a one that someone wishes to propose to the council for inclusion in the Local Development Plan (LDP). The Council is required to invite such proposals, and must then assess them as to their suitability for inclusion. The provision of as much information as possible will therefore assist, though it is understood that it may not be possible to answer all questions.

The overall Vision and Objectives for the plan have already been set following a public consultation exercise in 2008. It is advisable to consider these first as allocations of land in the plan will need to be consistent with the Vision and Objectives8.

The call for Candidate Sites is being made at the same time as the public consultation on Strategic Options for the plan. The council will use the results from these two consultations to help it in developing a Preferred Strategy for the plan.

The council is required to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) of the plan9. Information provided on the Candidate Sites Form will help the council to carry out the appraisal. If a site has not been assessed in this way it is unlikely that the Inspector at the public examination of the plan will be in a position to recommend its inclusion in the plan.

The council will reserve the right to correct factual inaccuracies in any submission, and to seek any further information considered necessary.

The Candidate Sites form can be used for proposing any type of use, which could include community aspirations for sites. Questions in section 7 would still apply as the Inspector at the public examination of the plan will need to be convinced that there was a reasonable prospect of the proposal being achieved for its inclusion to be recommended.

Any interested party will have the opportunity later in the plan making process to make representations on sites either proposed in the plan, or where others have proposed them as alternatives, or where they want to object to an omission of a site. The sites submitted now will be placed on a public register on the council website.

For further information, please see the Plan’s Delivery Agreement10, or contact the Planning Policy Team on 01633 656656, or email ldp.consultation@newport.gov.uk or view the website www.newport.gov.uk/planningpolicy

---

8 The agreed Vision and Objectives are available at: www.newport.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/report/cont345519.pdf or printed copies are available on request from the Planning Policy Team.
9 See, for example, the Scoping Report of the SA/SEA available at: www.newport.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/plans_and_strategies/cont324129.pdf
10 The Delivery Agreement is available at: www.newport.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/leaflets_and_brochures/cont218059.pdf or printed copies are available on request from the Planning Policy Team.