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1. Inspector to correspond with Natural Resources Wales regarding its views on the SA/SEA update reviewing the minor changes agreed in December 2013.

   N/A

2. CF13(vii) – South of Percoed Lane, Duffryn School Site – the suggested deletion of the site needs to be considered through the Examination process as a Proposed Change (Hearing Session 6).

   2.1 The deletion of the site was discussed at Hearing Session 6: Transport, Other Infrastructure and Community Facilities. The Council maintains its position that the Site should be removed.

3. The Council need to set out its approach/rationale to the inclusion of defined boundaries to small settlements in the Plan and review the need for boundaries for such settlements (rather than relying on national policy guidance in relation to development proposals).

   Introduction

   3.1 In the LDP, the Council’s overarching aim is to direct new development to sustainable locations – that is, places in which development can occur without detracting from the physical environment or from people’s quality of life. Village boundaries are established in order to allow modest development in rural locations. Such development may consist of residential or commercial uses, but the Council, bearing in mind Newport’s housing requirements until 2026, will generally favour proposals for affordable housing. This review, therefore, seeks to identify those villages that, by virtue of their proximity to public-transport networks and local services and amenities, may be able to accommodate appropriate development over the plan period.

   3.2 A points-based assessment suggests that six of the sixteen villages ought to be retained, with a couple of minor amendments, in the LDP: Underwood; Marshfield; Christchurch; Parc Seymour; Castleton; and Llanwern. Generally speaking, these villages are suitable candidates for modest development, particularly affordable housing, because they provide their residents with important facilities and frequent bus services to the city centre.

   Method

   3.3 The Council has used a points system in order to establish which of the sixteen villages in the Deposit LDP might be suitable for modest forms of development, such as affordable housing. No points-based assessment will ever produce indisputable results, and the relative weight given to certain attributes will always be contested. In this instance, however, it was felt appropriate to award points for public-transport connections, key facilities and services and, to a lesser extent, non-essential facilities and services. Points were deducted from villages that lay within, or were contiguous with, geographically or environmentally sensitive areas that made development less desirable.
Definitions used in scoring system

3.4 Key facility/service: One that many people, irrespective of their lifestyle choices, would need to use at some point — includes: convenience store; primary school; secondary school; post office; medical centre.

3.5 Non-essential facility/service: One that some people may wish to use at some point — includes: public house; place of worship; village hall/community centre.

3.6 Sensitive area: TAN 15 C1; TAN 15 C2; conservation area; green belt; green wedge; special landscape area; land of outstanding historic interest; and environmental space.

Allocation of points

- Presence of key facility/service within Deposit LDP village boundary = 2 points
- Presence of non-essential facility/service within Deposit LDP village boundary = 1 point
- Presence of bus stop within 500 metres of village Deposit LDP boundary = 2 points
- Provision of hourly bus service to city centre = 2 points
- Presence of train station within 500 metres of Deposit LDP village boundary = 2 points
- Provision of hourly train service to city centre = 2 points
- Village boundary lies within, or is contiguous with, a sensitive area = minus 1 point (for each constraint)
Summary of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Keep village boundary?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Underwood</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Penhow</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parc Seymour</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bishton</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lower Machen</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Llanwern</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nash</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Llanvaches</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Goldcliff</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Llandevaud</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Peterstone</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>St Brides</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Redwick</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please see Appendix 1 for a breakdown of scores – ideally printed @ A3 scale)

Notes:

- Llanwern, though unsuitable for development in its current form, is allocated as a large-scale housing site in the LDP. By 2030, it will provide a range of services and facilities to a greatly increased population. For this reason, it is felt that the village boundary, which indicates the approximate footprint of the housing development, ought to be retained.
- Penhow achieves a surprisingly high score because it is contiguous with only one sensitive area (Special Landscape Area). In most respects, though, it is unsuitable for further
development. It has a decent bus service, but basic facilities and services are scarce, and the village really just comprises a few houses next to a main road.

**Survey of villages**

**Underwood**
- Facilities/services within village boundary: post office; village hall/community centre; place of worship; primary school; medical centre; convenience store.
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Public transport: hourly bus service to city centre.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): environmental space.

**Penhow**
- Facilities/services within village boundary: village hall/community centre; local shop (currently closed, it seems, but could open again at any moment).
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Public transport: hourly bus service to city centre (No. 73 service: Chepstow-Caerwent-Parc Seymour-Newport).
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): Special Landscape Area.

**Christchurch**
- Facilities/services within village boundary: public house; village hall/community centre; place of worship.
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): environmental space.

**Castleton**
- Facilities/services within village boundary: public house; village hall/community centre; primary school.
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Public transport: hourly bus service to city centre.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): green belt; green wedge; Special Landscape Area.

**Marshfield**
- Facilities/services within village boundary: post office; public house; village hall/community centre; place of worship; convenience store.
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): TAN 15 C1; Green belt; Green wedge; Special Landscape Area; Land of Outstanding Historic Interest; Environmental spaces.

**Bishton**
- Facilities/services within village boundary: village hall/community centre
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): TAN 15 C1.
Parc Seymour

- Facilities/services within village boundary: convenience store
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Public transport: hourly bus service to city centre
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): Special Landscape Area; Environmental spaces.

Llanwern

- Facilities/services within village boundary: village hall/community centre
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): environmental spaces.

**Note:** A large-scale housing commitment will be developed over next 10-15 years; this will provide community facilities/services and affordable housing.

Llanvaches

- Facilities/services within village boundary: village hall/community centre; place of worship;
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): Special Landscape Area; environmental spaces.

Lower Machen

- Facilities/services within village boundary: place of worship
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Public transport: hourly bus service to city centre.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): conservation area; Special Landscape Area; environmental spaces.

Nash

- Facilities/services within village boundary: public house; village hall/community centre; place of worship
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): TAN 15 C1; Special Landscape Area; Land of Outstanding Historic Interest; environmental spaces.

Peterstone

- Facilities/services within village boundary: public house; village hall/community centre
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): TAN 15 C1; Green belt; Special Landscape Area; Land of Outstanding Historic Interest; environmental spaces.

Llandevaud

- Facilities/services within village boundary: none.
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: none.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): environmental spaces.
Redwick

- Facilities/services within village boundary: public house; village hall/community centre; place of worship
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: none.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): TAN 15 C1; conservation area; Special Landscape Area; Land of Outstanding Historic Interest; environmental spaces.

St Brides

- Facilities/services within village boundary: restaurant; place of worship.
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): TAN 15 C1; Green wedge; Special Landscape Area; Land of Outstanding Historic Interest; Environmental spaces.

Goldcliff

- Facilities/services within village boundary: public house; place of worship
- Facilities/services within 500 metres of village boundary: bus stop.
- Constraints (within or adjoining village boundary): TAN 15 C1; Special Landscape Area; Land of Outstanding Historic Interest; Environmental spaces.

Analysis

3.6 The Council feels that it could delete ten of the sixteen village boundaries without jeopardising its development strategy over the plan period. Such a move would reduce the number of locations eligible for affordable-housing exceptions, but it would also ensure that the remaining villages are genuinely capable of accommodating modest development. The removal of unsuitable village boundaries would also allow the Council to control development in additional areas of countryside. For instance, infill and backland development would be all but prohibited, proposals for replacement dwellings would have to comply with policy H12 of the LDP, and proposals for new dwellings would have to comply with Planning Policy Wales.
Suggested revisions to the remaining village boundaries

i. Marshfield: Delete the parcel of land to the south of “The Croft”, Wellfield Road (highlighted in pink);

- No planning history;
- Does not appear to form part of a domestic curtilage;
- Does not appear in the alternative-sites register.
ii. Christchurch: Delete the parcel of land to the south of “Spring Gardens”, Christchurch Road (highlighted in pink).

- No planning history;
- Does not appear to form part of a domestic curtilage;
- Does not appear in the alternative-sites register.

**Conclusion**

3.7 The Council used a points system in order to establish which of the sixteen villages in the Deposit LDP might be suitable for modest development. It was decided that the following villages ought to be retained throughout the plan period: Underwood; Marshfield; Christchurch; Parc Seymour; Castleton; and Llanwern. It was also decided that the following revisions ought to be made to village boundaries:

i. Marshfield: Delete the parcel of land to the south of “The Croft”, Wellfield Road; and

ii. Christchurch: Delete the parcel of land to the south of “Spring Gardens”, Christchurch Road
4. The Council to review the defined village boundaries to ensure they follow defensible features.

4.1 See response (including plans) to question 3.

5. The Council to consider the deletion of the last sentence of Policy SP10 – House Building Requirement due to this matter being adequately covered by SP5 - Countryside.

5.1 The Council agree with the proposed deletion and suggest the following rewording of Policy SP10:

*Please note that the total housing and affordable housing figure (highlighted in yellow) will need to be confirmed following the Councils response to Hearing Sessions 2, 3 & 4.*

**SP10 House Building Requirement**

PROVISION IS MADE FOR **11,622** UNITS TO DELIVER A HOUSING REQUIREMENT OF **10,350** UNITS OVER THE PLAN PERIOD. THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENT FOR THE PLAN PERIOD IS SET AT **8,901** UNITS AND THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET FOR THE PLAN PERIOD IS SET AT **2,527** UNITS.

THE LAND WILL BE PROVIDED PRIMARILY ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND IN THE FOLLOWING WAYS:

i) SITES WITH PLANNING PERMISSION, INCLUDING SITES UNDER CONSTRUCTION;

ii) THE EASTERN EXPANSION AREA;

iii) ALLOCATIONS SET OUT IN POLICY H1; AND

iv) INFILL, WINDFALL AND SMALL SITES.

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS COMPLIANT WITH POLICY H5 OR SET OUT IN NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY.

6. The Council to review of the wording of Policy SP5 to ensure consistency with other Plan policies including H10 – Conversions in the Countryside and H12 – Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside.

6.1 The Council consider that wording of Policy SP5 does not require amending but that additional text is submitted to the supporting text. The supporting text has been amended to clarify that Policy SP5 is relevant to all development and that only appropriate uses will be acceptable in the Countryside. The supporting text will clarify what is deemed appropriate i.e. that policies H10 and H12 are deemed appropriate uses within the Countryside.

6.2 Proposed amended text to paragraph 2.22 (supporting text of Policy SP5):

*The Council recognises the importance of protecting the countryside both for its own sake and because it provides a vital landscape setting for the urban area and transport corridors. The countryside has value for landscape, natural resources, agriculture, ecology, geology, history, archaeology and outdoor recreation. It will rarely be the appropriate location for development, except where this is for the specific benefit of the rural economy or the use satisfies policies H10 – Conversions in the Countryside and H12 – Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside.*
APPENDIX 1 – REVIEW OF VILLAGE BOUNDARIES -BREAKDOWN OF SCORES