Newport City Council

Local Development Plan

Hearing Session 15: Alternative Housing Sites 3 – Langstone, Parc Seymour, Penhow, Llanvaches, Bishton, Redwick

10am – Friday 9th May 2014

1. Rep 207: Land north of A48, and west of Halse Garden Centre, Langstone (approx 11 ha/250 units).

- **On what basis is the allocation contended to be needed in order to make the Plan sound? What evidence supports this argument?**

1.1 The Council is not promoting this site for inclusion in the Plan; this is for the representor to demonstrate. The Council is satisfied that sufficient land has been allocated for residential development to provide for the projected housing requirement: allocation of this site is not required to make the Plan sound.

- **Is the site free from constraints and deliverable?**

1.2 The Council's assessment is set out in the Alternative Sites Assessment at Revised Deposit Stage (SD31 – page 67).

1.3 The site contains Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and is crossed by a public right of way. The site is a mixture of grade 3a and 3b agricultural land. Land in grades 1, 2 and 3a should only be developed if there is an overriding need for the development, and either previously developed land or land in lower agricultural grades is unavailable.

1.4 Newport City Council's Green Services Section and Natural Resources Wales have objected on the basis that the proposal would encroach into an area of Countryside.

- **Would allocation of the site fit with the plan strategy? What principal factors lead to this view?**

1.5 The area is allocated as Countryside, and development of the site would serve to undermine that allocation. The eastern part of the site is allocated as a Sand and Gravel resource (approx. 1.8 ha), and development that would sterilise or hinder extraction of identified mineral resources will not be permitted (Policy M1).

1.6 The site's location does not reflect the underlying strategy of the Plan in focusing residential development on brownfield sites within the main urban area. The Council's Strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8 and this site is not considered to follow this sequence. Inclusion of the site for mixed use (including community facilities) development is not supported by the Council.

1.7 With regards to use of part of the site for community facilities, consideration of such uses can be made under the provisions of Policy SP12, which allows for community facilities within or adjacent to the defined urban and village settlements. Such developments do not necessitate a change to the village boundary.

2. Rep 2049: Land south of Parc Seymour (approx 1ha/?? units).

- **On what basis is the allocation contended to be needed in order to make the Plan sound? What evidence supports this argument?**

2.1 The Council is not promoting this site for inclusion in the Plan; this is for the representor to demonstrate. The Council is satisfied that sufficient land has been allocated for residential

development to provide for the projected housing requirement: allocation of this site is not required to make the Plan sound.

- **Is the site free from constraints and deliverable?**

2.2 The Council's assessment is set out in the Alternative Sites Assessment at Revised Deposit Stage (SD31 – page 43).

2.3 Part of the site is within an NRW surface water flood area. The site is a mixture of grade 3a and 3b agricultural land. Land in grades 1, 2 and 3a should only be developed if there is an overriding need for the development, and either previously developed land or land in lower agricultural grades is unavailable.

2.4 Natural Resources Wales have objected on the basis that the proposal would encroach into an area of Countryside.

- **Would allocation of the site fit with the plan strategy? What principal factors lead to this view?**

2.5 The area is allocated as Countryside and falls within the proposed Special Landscape Area (SLA) designation (Wentwood). The justification for its designation is set out in the Special Landscape Areas Background Paper – SD71. The SLAs have been designated on the basis of the nationally recognised LANDMAP assessment process. Development of the site would serve to undermine those allocations.

2.6 The site's location does not reflect the underlying strategy of the Plan in focusing residential development on brownfield sites within the main urban area. The Council's Strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8 and this site is not considered to follow this sequence. Inclusion of the site for residential development is not supported by the Council.

3. Rep 2074: Land at Rock Farm, Penhow (approx 8.5ha/?? units).

- **On what basis is the allocation contended to be needed in order to make the Plan sound? What evidence supports this argument?**

3.1 The Council is not promoting this site for inclusion in the Plan; this is for the representor to demonstrate. The Council is satisfied that sufficient land has been allocated for residential development to provide for the projected housing requirement: allocation of this site is not required to make the Plan sound.

- **Is the site free from constraints and deliverable?**

3.2 The Council's assessment is set out in the Alternative Sites Assessment at Revised Deposit Stage (SD31 – page 46).

3.3 Part of the site is within an NRW surface water flood area. The land is a grade 3a agricultural land. Land in grades 1, 2 and 3a should only be developed if there is an overriding need for the development, and either previously developed land or land in lower agricultural grades is unavailable.

3.4 Natural Resources Wales has objected on the basis that the proposal would encroach into an area of Countryside, and has stated that European protected species may be present on the site.

- **Would allocation of the site fit with the plan strategy? What principal factors lead to this view?**

3.5 The area is allocated as Countryside and falls within the proposed SLA designation (Wentwood). The justification for its designation is set out in the Special Landscape Areas Background Paper – SD71. The SLAs have been designated on the basis of the nationally recognised LANDMAP assessment process. The site is allocated for the safeguarding of mineral resources, and development that would sterilise or hinder extraction of identified mineral resources will not be permitted (Policy M1). Development of the site would serve to undermine the allocations set out above.

3.6 The site location does not reflect the underlying strategy of the Plan in focusing residential development on brownfield sites within the main urban area. The Council's Strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8 and this site is not considered to follow this sequence. Inclusion of the site for residential development is not supported by the Council.

4. Rep 2125: Land at The Cayo, Llanvaches (approx 1.75ha/?? units).

- **On what basis is the allocation contended to be needed in order to make the Plan sound? What evidence supports this argument?**

4.1 The Council is not promoting this site for inclusion in the Plan; this is for the representor to demonstrate. The Council is satisfied that sufficient land has been allocated for residential development to provide for the projected housing requirement: allocation of this site is not required to make the Plan sound.

- **Is the site free from constraints and deliverable?**

4.2 The Council's assessment is set out in the Alternative Sites Assessment at Revised Deposit Stage (SD31 – page 58).

4.3 The land is agricultural land (grade 1, 2, or 3a). Part of the site is within an EA surface water flood area. Land in grades 1, 2 and 3a should only be developed if there is an overriding need for the development, and either previously developed land or land in lower agricultural grades is unavailable.

4.4 The Newport City Council's Highways section objects on the grounds of sustainability and access. Newport City Council's Green Services section and Natural Resources Wales object on the grounds that the proposal would result in an incursion into an area of Countryside.

- **Would allocation of the site fit with the plan strategy? What principal factors lead to this view?**

4.5 The area is allocated as Countryside and falls within the proposed Special Landscape Area (SLA) designation (Wentwood). The justification for its designation is set out in the Special Landscape Areas Background Paper – SD71. The SLAs have been designated on the basis of the nationally recognised LANDMAP assessment process. The site is allocated for the safeguarding of mineral resources, and development that would sterilise or hinder extraction of identified mineral resources will not be permitted (Policy M1). Development of the site would serve to undermine the allocations set out above.

4.6 The site's location does not reflect the underlying strategy of the Plan in focusing residential development on brownfield sites within the main urban area. The Council's Strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8 and this site is not considered to follow this sequence. Inclusion of the site for residential development is not supported by the Council.

5. Rep 39 Bishton village development boundary.

- **On what basis are the changes sought contended to be needed in order to make the Plan sound? What evidence supports this argument?**

5.1 The Council is not promoting this site for inclusion in the Plan; this is for the representor to demonstrate. Following discussion at Session 1 in relation to village boundaries, and comments made by the Welsh Government, an additional evaluation of the boundaries has been carried out. In light of the comments and the additional work carried out, it is recommended that the village boundary around Bishton be removed in its entirety, and that usual development management policies relating to the countryside be applied to proposals in the area. The justification for this is that Bishton does not represent a sustainable location for development, and the removal of the village boundary would discourage inappropriate development within the area. Therefore based on discussions in Session 1, the Council not only considers that the Bishton village boundary should not be extended, but considers that the village boundary should be deleted altogether.

- **Would the changes sought be consistent with other elements of the Plan? What principal factors lead to this view?**

5.2 The Council is not promoting this site for inclusion in the Plan; this is for the representor to demonstrate. The site's location does not reflect the underlying strategy of the Plan in focusing residential development on brownfield sites within the main urban area. The Council's Strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8 and this site is not considered to follow this sequence. Bishton has minimal amenities and further development would be unsustainable. Inclusion of the area within the village boundary is not supported by the Council.

6. Rep 1425 Redwick village development boundary.

- **On what basis are the changes sought contended to be needed in order to make the Plan sound? What evidence supports this argument?**

6.1 The Council is not promoting this site for inclusion in the Plan; this is for the representor to demonstrate. Following discussion at Session 1 in relation to village boundaries, and comments made by the Welsh Government, an additional evaluation of the boundaries has been carried out. In light of the comments and the additional work carried out, it is recommended that the village boundary around Redwick be removed in its entirety, and

that usual development management policies relating to the countryside be applied to proposals in the area. The justification for this is that Redwick does not represent a sustainable location for development, and the removal of the village boundary would discourage inappropriate development within the area. Therefore based on discussions in Session 1, the Council not only considers that the Redwick village boundary should not be extended, but considers that the village boundary should be deleted altogether.

- **Would the changes sought be consistent with other elements of the Plan? What principal factors lead to this view?**

6.2 The Council is not promoting this site for inclusion in the Plan; this is for the representor to demonstrate. The site's location does not reflect the underlying strategy of the Plan in focusing residential development on brownfield sites within the main urban area. The Council's Strategy follows the search sequence approach advocated in Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 9.2.8 and this site is not considered to follow this sequence. Inclusion of the area within the village boundary is not supported by the Council. Redwick has minimal amenities and further development would be unsustainable.