

Representations Received on Alternative Sites Register

OCTOBER 2013

NEWPORT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
2011-26



NEWPORT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2011 - 2026

**Register of
Alternative Sites
Representations**

October 2013

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION3

2. GLOSSARY.....4

APPENDIX 1: Alternative Sites Representations

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Newport Local Development Plan was placed on Deposit and made available for public consultation on 13th June 2013 for over 6 weeks.
- 1.2 The consultation process on the Revised Deposit Local Development Plan resulted in 992 responses from 353 representors. The representations identified a number of proposals which requested changes to the Revised Plan and are known as Alternative Sites. These representations suggested the addition of new sites, amendments or deletions of allocations within the Plan.
- 1.3 The Council produced a Register of Alternative Sites and consulted on the Register on 6th September until the 18th October 2013. The representations received during this consultation period are set out in this report within Appendix 1.
- 1.4 Further to the register of representations being made available on the Council's website, hard copies of the Register of Alternative Sites representations are available to view at the following locations:
 - Information Station, Former Railway Station
 - Newport Libraries
- 1.6 If you require any further details on the information available then please do not hesitate to contact the Planning Policy Team on 01633 656656 or email ldp.consultation@newport.gov.uk.

2. GLOSSARY

ANG – Accessible Natural Greenspace
BGS – British Geological Survey
CIL – Community Infrastructure Levy
EEA – Eastern Expansion Area
G&T – Gypsy and Traveller
HRA – Habitat Regulations Assessment
IDB – Inland Drainage Board
LDP – Local Development Plan
NCC – Newport City Council
NNR – National Nature Reserves
PD – Permitted Development
SAC – Special Area of Conservation
SDR – Southern Distributor Road
SFCA – Strategic Flood Consequence Assessment
SINC – Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation
SLA – Special Landscape Area
SPG – Supplementary Planning Guidance
SSSI – Sites of Special Scientific Interest
TAN – Technical Advice Note
TIA – Traffic Impact Assessment
WG – Welsh Government

APPENDIX 1: Alternative Sites Representations

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Site,RepnType: (blank)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 2039.K1 | The Coal Authority | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Summary: Confirmation that the Coal Authority has no comments to make

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I can confirm that the Coal Authority has no specific comments or observations to make regarding these sites.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3886.K1 | Stock-O'Neill, Ms Alex | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Summary: Agrees with Ringland Matters Group submissions

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

"Ringland Matters Group" are now speaking for me.

See Rep 3982 for Ringland Matters Group representations.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3982.K3 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Summary: General comments regarding G&T sites

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number n/a |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name n/a |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

The Ringland Matters Group has twenty Committee Members and represents the residents that signed the Hartridge Farm Road Site and the Former Ringland Allotment petitions, previously submitted to the Council in July this year, as authorised within the wording of that petition, (referred to hereafter as the signatories).

It should be noted that the signatories numbered in excess of 5,300 individual names and addresses.

The Ringland Matters Group, on behalf of the signatories, would like to make the following comments on the Alternative Sites Register September 2013 proposed as part of the LDP as follows:

Part A: New sites proposed by Representors to be included in the Revised LDP

Ringland Matters Groups and its signatories would support the inclusion of any or all of the following as Gypsy and Traveller sites:

[Site-specific comments entered separately]

By contrast the sites referred to above over-whelmingly meet the Welsh Assembly Government and Newport City Council's policies regarding Gypsy and Traveller sites by a greater percentage than the existing proposed sites and should, therefore, be included in the LDP.

Part C: Sites proposed by Representors for deletion from the Revised LDP

The Ringland Matters Group would like to reiterate their objections and those of over five thousand signatories to the sites known as:

RAS(D)026 Former Ringland Allotments

RAS(D)Land at Hartridge Farm Road

and would support the deletion of these site allocations from the Revised LDP

In summary both these sites contravene Welsh Government and Newport City Council's own adopted policies in relation to:

Council guidelines
Human rights
Health issues
Location
Domination of the Local Community
Land presentation
Unsafe access
Existing use:

1. 'Former' Ringland allotments: still remains as a need for the local community.

2. Hartridge Farm Road Site: is the home of the Road Safety Centre that provides a valuable service to the whole of Newport and in particular young students of low attainment. The site is also adjacent the well established RSPCA Shelter which will not be able successfully operate due to the close proximity of the proposed site creating on going disturbances that will result in an intolerable nuisance for the shelter, travellers and existing residents alike.

Aspect
Safety
Environmental

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| Amenities Flooding Financial implications Privacy and noise | | | | | | | | | | |

Further, the Group, on behalf of the signatories, would like to remind the Council of the independent report it submitted during the previous June/July consultation that raises issues that seriously questions the validity of the Council's Revised Local Development Plan. A further copy is attached for reference.

4 4 Additional Material Yes

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes

All 15 sites listed as attached

Highly emotive

The large number of residents represented by the group

The large number of residents supporting the group

Site,RepnType: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway,

126.K1 Gwent Wildlife Trust 09/10/2013 W O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)052

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Rear of 15 Ridgeway

3 3 Representation

We wish to object to the proposal that this site be allocated for residential development as it is currently a valuable wildlife habitat, broadleaved woodland.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3216.K1 | Vines, c/o Nicola | Alder King | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Additional support for inclusion of Rear of 15 Ridgeway within the Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I am instructed by the landowner of an area of land to the rear of 15 Ridgeway, Newport, edged red on the attached plan, (alternative sites ref: RAS(N)052) to submit representations and details of the site to the current alternative sites consultation as a potential future residential development site. The site has an area of approximately 1.8 hectares (4.3 acres).

Representations were also made to the Deposit Local Development Plan consultation in July 2013.

My clients land is "Greenfield" but is located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and has good links with the wider urban area. The site is very well located in relation to the settlement and is well connected being within a reasonable walking/cycling distance from existing local facilities and employment opportunities. There are bus stops along Ridgeway providing regular services to the City Centre and railway station. The site is also readily accessible to the M4 motorway to the west via the B4591. This is therefore a highly sustainable location.

Additionally, we are not aware of any site specific, technical or infrastructure constraints that would inhibit or unduly constrain development. Furthermore there are no landscape designations or safeguards on the site.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, with various local facilities including a primary school and convenience shops in close proximity. Residential development would therefore be appropriate in this location.

Although being located outside of the development boundary there is other development in the surrounding vicinity including a riding school directly to the north west of the site. The M4 motorway provides containment to growth along this north western edge of the City and it is therefore considered that this location would be a suitable area for future expansion of the urban area.

The settlement boundary should be reviewed with a view to amending it in this location in the long term to include this area and allow for its development in the future.

My client would like to promote this land for residential development in the period to 2026 and beyond and would appreciate an acknowledgment of this letter and acknowledgement that the land will be noted as available and suitable as part of the examination into the Local Development Plan and any subsequent site allocation documents.

As summarised above, the land is available, well related to the settlement and to employment and community facilities. Residential development would be appropriate in this location and fit with the surrounding context. Although we acknowledge that adequate housing land has been identified to meet the LDP's current housing requirements, we consider that this site has potential as a long term housing site should additional land be required towards the end of the current plan period or in the next plan period. We believe that the proposed policies should be revised to allow for the development of sites like this in the event that additional land is required.

I would be grateful if you could keep me informed of progress of the Local Development Plan as well as other emerging planning policy documents, especially where there are opportunities for submitting representations and promoting sites for development.

If you require any further details in relation to this site in order to consider it as a potential housing site then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3520.K1 | Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited | Savills | | 26/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)052

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rear of 15 Ridgeway

3 3 Representation

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | Yes | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--|

Savills is instructed, on behalf of Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited ('Walters'), to make comments on Newport Council's 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Alcan/Novelis factory site (now known as Jubilee Park) was granted on 10 August 2013. In this time, considerable work has been done by Walters to allow land reclamation and remediation works to start on site. Alongside this work, Walters has also submitted to the Council a reserved matters application for the first phase of infrastructure and landscaping works. All this activity and momentum is very positive and reinforces their commitment to Jubilee Park and its future development in the plan period.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP and Revised Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations provide the context to our comments on the proposed 'Alternative Sites'. There is significant alignment between Walters' ambitions for the site and the content of the emerging LDP and, on this basis, much of what was said to the Deposit Plan(s) is positive and supportive. However, there were some areas of the plan that we consider can and should be improved and these are carried forward in our representations to the 'Alternative Sites'.

The main concern in these representations relate to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over the plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations.

Jubilee Park is allocated under Policy H1(54), which is identified to deliver nearly 925 new homes (although the outline consent allows up to 1,200) within the plan period.

The draft plans' strategic policies, Policy SP1(ii), makes it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction – a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Jubilee Park, remains a priority throughout the plan period. This priority gives those committed brownfield sites an opportunity to deliver the housing proposed without releasing excess land that is not required to meeting need during the plan period. As such, we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be released only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The representations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than the Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The figure that the sites summarised under parts i – iv of their policy comes to nearly 12,000, which is substantially more land than is required and, on the face of it, is a significant and unnecessary contingency.

If there is doubt about performance, the allocations under Policy H1 are so large (with the possibility of delivering more) that, even with the removal of the greenfield releases both the 7,500 figure and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. Therefore, the reasonable approach, which was set out in our representations would be to reserve any greenfield sites for release at a later stage of the plan (if required at all). In this regard, our representations also referred to the need to establish a clearer sequence in points i – iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1. It should, therefore, be made clear that the preference in each category will be for the redevelopment of previously developed sites rather than through the release of greenfield land. This installs the proper planning sequence in accordance with national policy.

Alternative Sites

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

Regardless of this over provision and as stated above, national policy includes a strong sequential preference for the best and most effective use of land in urban areas – and especially previously developed land, which should be used before greenfield or undeveloped sites. The adopted development plan and emerging LDP also clearly reference the sequential priority to be given to the effective use of previously developed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| <p>However, all those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | Yes |
| <p>There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there is sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| 3682.K1 | Loudon, Ms Rhian | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | | M |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Object to additional housing on greensites in Rogerstone

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)052 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Rear of 15 Ridgeway | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation with the established housing plans for the novilli site in rogerstone it would make me vary sad to see more countryside lost to residential housing when there cannot be private housing need in west newport. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K1 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential use

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)052 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Rear of 15 Ridgeway | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Rear of 15 Ridgeway Proposed residential use in area allocated as Open Countryside (Greenfield) site. The proposal would result in piecemeal encroachment into the open countryside contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development.* *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. Contrary to ToS P2, C2, CE1, CE2 | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| | | *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3997.K1 | Fouweather, Cllr David | | | 12/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Objection to proposed new site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)052

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rear of 15 Ridgeway

3 3 Representation

Land to the rear of 15 Ridgeway.

The ward Councillors are concerned about this new residential site proposal. The vast majority of this area is open countryside . There are already sufficient brownfield sites designated for future housing needs without encroaching on the countryside.

3998.K1 Ferris, Cllr Charles

12/09/2013 E O M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Objection to proposed new site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)052

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rear of 15 Ridgeway

3 3 Representation

Land to the rear of 15 Ridgeway.

The ward Councillors are concerned about this new residential site proposal. The vast majority of this area is open countryside . There are already sufficient brownfield sites designated for future housing needs without encroaching on the countryside.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4010.K1 | Thomas, Ms Rebecca | | | 21/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Object to proposed development at rear of 15 Ridgeway

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)205 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Rear of 15 Ridgeway | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I feel very strongly that there are few untouched areas of countryside within Newport and this development will aid in reducing them. The road a long ridgeway is a busy road which know doubt will get more traffic from the development in Allt-yr-yn avenue and yet another housing development will increase traffic further. As a near resident to this proposed development I am anxious that this will affect this untouched contryside and wildlife.It would be a great shame to destroy this beautiful area, and I hope that this area will be fully looked at in an ecological way so that no plant life or trees are destroyed by the development proposed. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4033.K1 | Taylor, Mrs Caroline | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)052

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rear of 15 Ridgeway

3 3 Representation

I would like to register my objection to the above proposal to change the allocation of land to rear of 15 Ridgeway from Countryside to Residential Development.

The proposed area will remove established woodland and spoil an area of natural beauty, there are known habits for bat species, foxes and badgers within this area which would be eradicated if the use was changed from countryside.

I'm aware of the requirements for additional housing, and there have been many proposals to remove green-belt designation from rear of Ridgeway and Glasllwch Crescent, enabling entrance to this area for residential development will enable the entire area to be developed.

The woods within this area help to clear the emissions experienced from the motorway and increased traffic levels on the roads within this area, this makes this a pleasant and highly desirable area in which to live, removal of woodland will reduce this ability and devalue existing properties within the area. Additional housing will also put additional pressure on the current road infrastructure which is already having difficulties coping with existing traffic levels.

This proposal appears to be a Newport Councils' sneaky attempt to finally achieve the development of this area, blotting an area of natural beauty within which the Sirhowy Walk forms a significant part. Newport CC wish to show themselves as the people's council but they don't seem to be listening to residents or tourists when spoiling existing attractions and landscapes.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4072.K1 | Stacey, Mr Brian | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Object to the alternative site suggested at Rear of Ridgeway.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)052 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Rear of 15 Ridgeway |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have the following comments for opposing this proposals: 1. Loss of ancient (400 year old) woodland. 2. Housing development outside the defined urban/settlement boundary. 3. New & dangerous access road on corner of Ridgeway. 4. Visual & amenity impact to existing residents. 5. Impact on wildlife and ecology after removal of their woodland habitat. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4089.K1 | Bray, Mr & Mrs | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

I write on behalf of my clients, Mr & Mrs Bray, with regard to proposed site AS(N)048: Land to rear of 15 Ridgeway. The proposers of this site are currently seeking a new residential allocation through the Local Development Plan (LDP) process.

My clients currently reside at 13a Ridgeway, a neighbouring property to the subject site. We wish to submit representations to strongly oppose the allocation of the site for residential development.

The site comprises two separate parcels of land:

- (1) The northern part, comprises circa 1.55ha of dense mature ancient woodland;
- (2) The southern part, measuring circa 0.25ha, comprises of 15 Ridgeway; a semi detached residential property and adjoining rear garden.

The site is considered wholly unsuitable for residential development for the following reasons:

(1) Sufficient Housing Land Supply - The Council have identified sufficient housing land supply to accommodate the identified, evidence based, housing requirement for Newport. In fact the emerging LDP has allowed for an element of flexibility and provides for a 12% oversupply of housing provision in the plan period (provision for 11,622 residential units compared to a requirement of 10,350 residential units). In addition to the identified oversupply we understand that there are also long term plans for the redevelopment of the St Cadocs Hospital site. This 8ha site could accommodate up to 250 residential units and would provide a further supply of housing provision over and above that identified for the LDP period.

It is evidently clear that there is no requirement/need to allocate any further land for housing over and above that already allocated in the emerging LDP; a view accepted by the planning agent acting on behalf of the proposers for this site. Any further housing allocation, particularly on 'greenfield sites', would stifle the redevelopment of important brownfield sites coming forward.

(2) Preference for the Re-use of Land - The long established and recognised sustainable development principle that previously development (or brownfield) land should be used in preference to 'greenfield sites' is set out in Planning Policy Wales (PPW) (para 4.9). In accordance with PPW these sustainable development principles are echoed in Objective 1 and Policy SP1 of the Council's Revised Deposit Newport LDP. The site is a 'greenfield site' of significant environmental value. The development of the site would be contrary, and indeed harmful, to the sustainable principles set out by the Welsh Government in PPW and by the Council in the Revised Deposit Newport LDP.

(3) Council's Key Strategy for Accommodating Growth - The allocation/development of this site for residential would be contrary to the Council's key strategy of accommodating economic growth within the development boundary and, in particular, the Eastern Expansion Area.

(4) Protected Countryside - The majority of the site is located outside the defined development boundary within protected countryside (as identified in the adopted UDP and emerging LDP). The allocation of the site for development and its inclusion within the development boundary would be contrary to the Council's objectives of protecting the Countryside from inappropriate development. As recognised by the Council's Revised Deposit LDP Policy SP5 the Countryside will rarely be an appropriate location for development, except where it is for the specific benefit of the rural economy. The development of the site for residential could not, by any measure, be considered to deliver any benefits to the rural economy.

(5) Protected Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) - The majority of the site is occupied by a ASNW and is positioned in a prominent hillside location. The woodland has developed naturally and comprises a mix of important native tree species which have been in existence since at least 1600. PPW (para 5.2.9) advises local planning authorities to protect trees, groups of trees, and areas of woodland where they have natural heritage value or contribute to the character or amenity of a particular locality. PPW identifies that ASNW's are irreplaceable habitats of high biodiversity value which should be protected from development. The development of the site for residential would result in significant and irreplaceable harm to the protected ASNW.

(6) Harm to Ecology / biodiversity - The ASNW is of great importance to habitats. It provides a range of habitats which support a wide diversity of plants and animals. The impact from the felling of the ASNW and mature trees in the curtilage of 15 Ridgeway would result in a significant harmful effect on important habitats, ecology and biodiversity.

(7) Harm to Residential Amenity - A residential development and associated road infrastructure from Ridgway and to the side and rear of 15 Ridgeway would be located in close proximity to 'habitable rooms' of neighbouring residential properties and adjacent to private rear gardens. The impact of the development of the site for residential would result in significant adverse harm to the amenity of surrounding residents including their enjoyment of their gardens.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

It is noted that the planning authority considered the suitability of the site for residential development in their Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013. The recommendation of the planning authority is to not include the site in the LDP for development. This recommendation is supported by Local Ward Council Members, Gwent Wildlife Trust and The Countryside Council for Wales.

We fully endorse the planning authority's recommendation and also the views expressed by ward members, Gwent Wildlife Trust and the Countrywide Council for Wales. It is clearly evident that the site is wholly unsuitable for development.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | Yes |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4094.K1 | Sweeney, Mr Alun | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Object to proposed development at Rear of Ridgeway

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

We hereby provide a formal objection to the plans for development at the rear of 15 Ridgeway. Housing Estate proposed for and at the rear of 15 Ridgeway - Site Ref Number AS(N) 048 OR RAS (N) 052 (two references provided as I have some confusion as to which is the correct one based on discussions with my legal and planning advisers. Please make sure that this feedback is taken for the relevant application).

By chance, I have recently become aware that a public consultation started in September where members of the public can comment on a range of different planning proposals – including the aforementioned “proposal” for development at the rear of 15 Ridgeway (and indeed the proposal envisages development of the rear of 13 / 14 and 16 Ridgeway as well). I must say that I find it most disturbing that a resident like myself who would be directly impacted by a proposal such as this, is not contacted directly by the council to seek feedback on such proposals - given that land directly to the rear of my property is land which is the subject of the proposal!

This letter should be taken as formal comment to you at Newport City Council, for the proposals referred to above – which we require you to take into consideration. In addition, given that we are potentially directly impacted by the proposal, we would appreciate if you would revert to us to confirm that the council is acting in accordance with laid down process and procedures in NOT directly communicating such proposals to impacted residents – and merely posting such potential proposals via the internet. Your feedback on this is important and would be appreciated by us.

Formal Comment summarised below (taking into account of feedback from legal and planning advisers as well as feedback from other residents of Ridgeway who we have discussed this proposal with) :

1. Sustainability Appraisal

Following a review of plans presented, the site submission does not include a “Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating a strategic environment assessment)”. Our planning and legal advisers confirm that for any site proposal to be considered for planning, it needs to always be accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal. As a Sustainability Appraisal has not been provided this is a critical omission / failing of the proposal submitted for development at the rear of 15 Ridgeway and as such the application for development should be rejected.

2. Proposal is completely out of keeping / context with the existing strongly defined pattern of development along Ridgeway

There is a strong existing pattern of development along Ridgeway. The proposal is not “infill” or “rounding off” – but rather it is an uncharacteristic extension beyond settlement limits into open country-side / woodland. Any development on part of this country-side / woodland, would be out of keeping with this current strongly defined pattern of development along Ridgeway and as such, should be rejected.

3. Loss of Woodland / area of natural beauty

The proposed development would result in the loss of a significant area of woodland which has been in existence for many hundreds of years. Any development of this land would be an uncharacteristic incursion into open country-side. There are many old beautiful trees which would inevitably have to be cut down to build a housing estate and this is of particular concern to us/ nature lovers in general.

4. Impact on environment / local ecology

The loss of woodland would have a very negative impact on the local ecology of the area. The woodland is home to many birds indeed animals in general - removal of their woodland habitat would have fatal consequences for much of this wild-life.

5. New access point onto Ridgeway on a bend and at the crest of a hill - safety issue

Access to the proposed new development would be via a new junction at a point on Ridgeway which is near to the crest of a hill, on a bend and at a point where driver visibility is not ideal. The lower part of Ridgeway already has a recognised safety problem with cars speeding (either coming up Ridgeway hill from Risca Road or proceeding down Ridgeway from Allt yr yn Road). A new housing estate with access at this dangerous part of Ridgeway, with less than ideal visibility and where cars are often speeding, would represent a significant health and safety issue for residents and drivers alike. My wife and I did some “on site testing today” using our family car to exit where a new road junction would be located and we strongly believe that in winter, any new junction could be an accident hotspot.

6. Significant increased traffic, particularly at peak times of the day

Additional traffic inevitably resulting from any new estate at the rear of 15 Ridgeway, would have a negative impact on both residents of Ridgeway as well as the Ridgeway area in general. In addition, vehicles are already regularly backed up along Ridgeway (leading down to Risca road) at peak times due to congestion on Risca Road. Vehicles can be backed up beyond 15 Ridgeway already and with the housing development at the former Allt yr yn University site coming on stream shortly, this congestion will inevitably become worse. Should a further new housing estate come on stream at the rear of 15 Ridgeway, the issue would be even worse and have a negative impact on residents of the local vicinity in general.

7. Visual and amenity impact for existing residents – including increase of noise pollution

Construction of a new housing estate at the rear of 15 Ridgeway will have a huge short term as well as medium / long term impact on my family as well as other local residents of Ridgeway. In addition,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

a new estate will increase noise pollution. Many Ridgeway residents are protected to some degree from the noise pollution from the M4, by the woodland at the rear of 15 Ridgeway. With the removal of this woodland noise pollution for my residence and others directly impacted by this proposed development, will increase.

In summary, there are many reasons why we (and indeed all local residents I have spoken to) believe that inclusion of the proposed development proposed for the rear of 15 Ridgeway in the LDP would not make the LDP a "sound one". These are outlined above. Notably,

- we believe that the plan fails a "Soundness test" (P2 in particular)

- we do not believe that the site proposal is founded on a robust and credible evidence base and as a result fails the CE2 test

Our understanding is that your responsibility is to ensure that planning strategy, policies and allocations are realistic and appropriate having considered relevant alternatives including all factors outlined above. Taking into account all of the facts (including those outlined above), we believe that you should not consider this proposal as an alternative site to those already in the Deposit LDP and we believe that the Housing estate proposal presented should therefore be rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4123.K1 | Turner, Brian | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

Summary: Object to the suggested site at 15 Ridgeway.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)057

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Rear of No. 15 Ridgeway

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

I would like to ask why I was not notified by the City Council immediately this written submission was made on behalf of the land owner.

Also, I would like to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed development on the following grounds.

1. The proposal involves the demolition of Ridgeway House, a dwelling house which has some architectural merit and is part of one of the first dwelling houses on Ridgeway, built circa 1926.
2. I live at no. 17, Ridgeway which is attached to no.15. If no.15 were to be demolished, my house would be totally disfigured. The party wall between no. 15 and no. 17 Ridgeway is not on a straight line, but is a double zig zag on plan. The resultant disfiguration would definitely not enhance the road scene in Ridgeway which is currently one of the most pleasant, unspoilt thoroughfares in Newport and deserves to remain so. I attached a plan of no. 17 showing the line of the party wall.
3. The visual and amenity impact of these proposals would be, for existing residents, horrendous.
4. The proposed housing estate would entail the destruction of mature landscape gardens, and more importantly, the clearance of mature ancient woodlands which, I am told, have been in existence for more than 400 years and which definitely teems with wildlife. The effect on wildlife and ecology in this area would be devastating.
5. If this development is permitted, undoubtedly other applications for development on adjacent land would follow, leading to further danger to our country side and the fragmentation of the road of Ridgeway and the countryside and other woodland to the north of Ridgeway.
6. This proposed development would involve a new access road off Ridgeway at a gradient of 1 in 6. Ridgeway already suffers from congestion with cars, waiting to get onto Risca Road / Glasllwch Crescent at peak times, queuing right back to Redbrook Road. This development would exacerbate the problem and lead to more pollution and accidents.
7. I submit that this proposed development should be denied on the grounds outlined above and for the reasons of visual and amenity impact for existing residents and the community at large. This proposed housing development is outside the urban / settlement boundary resulting in further encroachment of the country side.
8. Furthermore, it goes directly against the local development plan 2011-2026 which places emphasis on:-

Foreword

2nd paragraph.... the plan..... protects and enhances natural environments and conserves Newport's built heritage.

3rd paragraph.... right type of development in the right location.

Introduction and Overview

Para 1.9..... use of redundant sites with emphasis on brown field sites and affordable housing (affordable housing is unlikely at Ridgeway!!)

Para 1.19..... building on previously developed land to protect the countryside and other green spaces.

There are several other references to the use of brown field sites and also the conservation of the countryside.

Site,RepnType: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway, New Site

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3394.K1 | Evans, Cllr Matthew | | | 12/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 470/ Rear of 15 Ridgeway

New Site

Summary: Objection to proposed new site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)052

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rear of 15 Ridgeway

3 3 Representation

Land to the rear of 15 Ridgeway.

The ward Councillors are concerned about this new residential site proposal. The vast majority of this area is open countryside. There are already sufficient brownfield sites designated for future housing needs without encroaching on the countryside.

Site,RepnType: 471/ Queenshill School,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K1 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 471/ Queenshill School

Summary: No problems envisaged at the receiving Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW)

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site. Our records indicate that there has been an incident of internal flooding to a property downstream of the development site. A scheme to resolve this issue has been factored into our current Capital Investment Programme. Potential developers can either wait for Dwr Cymru Welsh Water to resolve this situation, or alternatively, can progress the site through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or Section 106 Town & Country Planning Act 1990. No problems are envisaged at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3507.K1 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 471/ Queenshill School

Summary: Supports proposed inclusion of site as residential development at Queenshill School

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
This is a prime development for the city and we support its allocation.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K26 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 471/ Queenshill School

Summary: Comments on proposed residential development at Queenshill School

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
No ecological comment. Potential for ANG Trees currently protected by Authority with potential for TPO

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4086.K1 | Cross, Mr Michael | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 471/ Queenshill School

Summary: Objects to the suggested site at Queenshill School site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)053

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Queenshill School

3 3 Representation

I wish to appeal against the possible use of this site for the following reasons. 1. Access - The access points cannot be widened because of buildings either side of the entrance. They are very narrow. The access point on St Marks Crescent is a narrow road with residential parking on both sides of the road. It will not be possible to get caravans and large towing vehicles into and out of the site from this point. Also, the access point on Fields Road, although a wider road is near a very busy junction used for the school, post office depot, the Civic Centre and also the railway station if coming from the north of the city. Large vehicles and caravans coming in and out of the site in this, the only realistic access point will cause major disruption on an already busy road because of the narrowness of the access point here. 2. On a purely personal note, it will have a detrimental impact on the house prices of the surrounding area along with all the usual problems associated with traveller sites such as noise, rubbish and fly tipping in the area

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

4093.K1 Dormer, Ms Leanne

17/10/2013

W

O

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 471/ Queenshill School

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Queenshill School

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I wish to Appeal against the use of Queenshill School as an alternative site. Access points at St Marks Cres and Fields Road are too narrow for the size of vehicles that will require access to the site. These can't be widened as space is restricted by the adjoining buildings. Not enough turning space at each access point as residents park there cars on both sides of the road. Most of this area is residents permit parking only however any available street parking in this area is used by employees who work in town centre, civic centre, info station, or for school drops off etc. Congestion is high already in the Fields Road area. Vehicles trying to drive into this tight space will make the situation worse.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4128.K1 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 471/ Queenshill School

Summary: Historic built environment comments on Queenshill School site.

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)053 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Queenshill School. |
| 3 | 3 | Representation This site is adjacent to a grade II listed building (20528 - Shire Hall). Development has potential to affect the setting of the listed building but may be acceptable in principle. |

Site,RepnType: 472/ Yew Tree Cottage,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1117.K4 | Herbert, Richard | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 472/ Yew Tree Cottage

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land as Gypsy and Traveller residential site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)002

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Yew Tree Cottage, Bettws

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)002 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- C2 in that the allocation of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site outside of the settlement boundary is not compliant with national policy as set out in WAG Circular 30/2007 and Planning Policy Wales; and
- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)002 seeks the allocation of land for Gypsy and Traveller Residential Accommodation.

Paragraph 9.2.21 of Planning Policy Wales (2012 5th Ed) states that "Local authorities are required to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsy families. It is therefore important that local planning authorities have policies for the provision of Gypsy sites in their development plans".

Whilst it is not disagreed that sufficient provision should be provided it is important that it is within a suitable and sustainable location. Therefore, when assessing the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites regard should be had to the guidance contained within WAG Circular 30/2007 - Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites. Paragraph 20 outlines that "In deciding where to provide for Gypsy and Traveller sites, local planning authorities should first consider locations in or near existing settlements with access to local services e.g., shops, doctors, schools, employment, leisure and recreation opportunities, churches and other religious establishments".

Given that the proposed allocation for the site would effectively allow Gypsy and Traveller to reside in designated Countryside (Policy SP5) regard should also be had to the principles of identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans as set out within Planning Policy Wales Paragraph 9.2.8. It states that 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. The same principle should be utilised for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation allocations.

It is considered that the proposed allocation of the site at Yew Tree Cottage, Bettws, does not take account of the above guidance and it is an isolated site significantly separated from the settlement of Bettws and without significant infrastructure.

4 4 Additional Material

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | Yes | | | | | |
| 3683.K2 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 472/ Yew Tree Cottage

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for G&T residential site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|---|--|--------|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number | RAS(N)002 | |
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name | Yew Tree Cottage | |
| 3 3 | Representation | Yew Tree Cottage The proposal would result in piecemeal encroachment into the open countryside contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development. Contrary to ToS C2, CE1 | |
| 4 4 | Additional Material | See hyperlink. | Yes |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K6 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 472/ Yew Tree Cottage

Summary: Support for proposed allocation of land as G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)002 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Yew Tree Cottage | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support the inclusion of this site as it was part of the original LDP and was successfully appraised as a residential site. I can find no justification for its removal? My only assumption is it was political. The scrutiny committee changed and all of a sudden all the sites changed - funny that as the original sites appeared in their home areas? And the "new" sites do no!? | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts As a resident directly affected I have valid questions & concerns to raise. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K1 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 472/ Yew Tree Cottage

Summary: Support for allocation of land as G&T residential accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)002 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Yew Tree Cottage | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation An original site that would have been previously successfully appraised by the Council as a residential site with no justification for its removal. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed as attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3992.K3 | Sullivan, Mrs J | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 472/ Yew Tree Cottage

Summary: Propose that the site at Yew Tree Cottage is a preferable Gypsy and Traveller site to that at Hartridge Farm Road

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)002 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Yew Tree Cottage | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have look at proposed sites for Gypsy Camp and feel that these three sites will have the least impact on surrounding residential areas. They are easily accessible and amenities are not far away. I feel that the Hartridge site is too close to an already troubled area, which is trying hard to improve. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Site,RepnType: 473/ Llwynhaid Farm,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3520.K2 | Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited | Savills | | 26/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 473/ Llwynhaid Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)031

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Llwynhaid Farm, Bettws

3 3 Representation

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | Yes | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--|

Savills is instructed, on behalf of Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited ('Walters'), to make comments on Newport Council's 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Alcan/Novelis factory site (now known as Jubilee Park) was granted on 10 August 2013. In this time, considerable work has been done by Walters to allow land reclamation and remediation works to start on site. Alongside this work, Walters has also submitted to the Council a reserved matters application for the first phase of infrastructure and landscaping works. All this activity and momentum is very positive and reinforces their commitment to Jubilee Park and its future development in the plan period.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP and Revised Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations provide the context to our comments on the proposed 'Alternative Sites'. There is significant alignment between Walters' ambitions for the site and the content of the emerging LDP and, on this basis, much of what was said to the Deposit Plan(s) is positive and supportive. However, there were some areas of the plan that we consider can and should be improved and these are carried forward in our representations to the 'Alternative Sites'.

The main concern in these representations relate to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over the plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations.

Jubilee Park is allocated under Policy H1(54), which is identified to deliver nearly 925 new homes (although the outline consent allows up to 1,200) within the plan period.

The draft plans' strategic policies, Policy SP1(ii), makes it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction – a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Jubilee Park, remains a priority throughout the plan period. This priority gives those committed brownfield sites an opportunity to deliver the housing proposed without releasing excess land that is not required to meeting need during the plan period. As such, we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be released only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The representations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than the Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The figure that the sites summarised under parts i – iv of their policy comes to nearly 12,000, which is substantially more land than is required and, on the face of it, is a significant and unnecessary contingency.

If there is doubt about performance, the allocations under Policy H1 are so large (with the possibility of delivering more) that, even with the removal of the greenfield releases both the 7,500 figure and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. Therefore, the reasonable approach, which was set out in our representations would be to reserve any greenfield sites for release at a later stage of the plan (if required at all). In this regard, our representations also referred to the need to establish a clearer sequence in points i – iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1. It should, therefore, be made clear that the preference in each category will be for the redevelopment of previously developed sites rather than through the release of greenfield land. This installs the proper planning sequence in accordance with national policy.

Alternative Sites

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

Regardless of this over provision and as stated above, national policy includes a strong sequential preference for the best and most effective use of land in urban areas – and especially previously developed land, which should be used before greenfield or undeveloped sites. The adopted development plan and emerging LDP also clearly reference the sequential priority to be given to the effective use of previously developed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

However, all those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | Yes |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|

There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| 3663.K1 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | | M |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 473/ Llwynhaid Farm

Summary: Not a sustainable location

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

RAS(N)031 Llwynhaid Park Bettws
Access will require extensive removal of hedging to provide minimal visibility splay. Road widening required to provide footways. Transport assessment required. The site is located in Parking Zone 6. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| 3673.K14 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | | M |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 473/ Llwynhaid Farm

Summary: Comments on proposed residential development at Llwynhaid Farm, Bettws

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

Bettws Brook SINC runs through site. Incursion into open countryside.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K3 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 473/ Llwynhaid Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)031

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Llwynhaid Farm

3 3 Representation
Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Open Countryside (Greenfield) site*

Record of otters along Bettws Brook which runs through site^

This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas as set out in the LDP. The site is partially located within Zone C2, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the site to be partially within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability tidal flood outlines of the Bettws Brook ++

(See additional information)

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|---|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | | Yes |
| <p>*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.</p> <p>^For sites with known potential for EPS: The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP. We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range. We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.</p> <p>++ For sites located within Zone C2: We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2." In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.</p> <p>(See hyperlink)</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4032.K1 | Tariq, Mr Muhammad | | | 01/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 473/ Llwynhaid Farm

Summary: Supports proposed residential use

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)031 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Not provided | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Both of the above sites for their planned usage is supported. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Site,RepnType: 474/ Bettws Hill,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3520.K3 | Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited | Savills | | 26/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 474/ Bettws Hill

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)032 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Bettws Hill |
| 3 | 3 | Representation In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule). All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

Yes

Savills is instructed, on behalf of Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited ('Walters'), to make comments on Newport Council's 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Alcan/Novelis factory site (now known as Jubilee Park) was granted on 10 August 2013. In this time, considerable work has been done by Walters to allow land reclamation and remediation works to start on site. Alongside this work, Walters has also submitted to the Council a reserved matters application for the first phase of infrastructure and landscaping works. All this activity and momentum is very positive and reinforces their commitment to Jubilee Park and its future development in the plan period.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP and Revised Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations provide the context to our comments on the proposed 'Alternative Sites'. There is significant alignment between Walters' ambitions for the site and the content of the emerging LDP and, on this basis, much of what was said to the Deposit Plan(s) is positive and supportive. However, there were some areas of the plan that we consider can and should be improved and these are carried forward in our representations to the 'Alternative Sites'.

The main concern in these representations relate to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over the plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations.

Jubilee Park is allocated under Policy H1(54), which is identified to deliver nearly 925 new homes (although the outline consent allows up to 1,200) within the plan period.

The draft plans' strategic policies, Policy SP1(ii), makes it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction – a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Jubilee Park, remains a priority throughout the plan period. This priority gives those committed brownfield sites an opportunity to deliver the housing proposed without releasing excess land that is not required to meeting need during the plan period. As such, we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be released only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The representations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than the Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The figure that the sites summarised under parts i – iv of their policy comes to nearly 12,000, which is substantially more land than is required and, on the face of it, is a significant and unnecessary contingency.

If there is doubt about performance, the allocations under Policy H1 are so large (with the possibility of delivering more) that, even with the removal of the greenfield releases both the 7,500 figure and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. Therefore, the reasonable approach, which was set out in our representations would be to reserve any greenfield sites for release at a later stage of the plan (if required at all). In this regard, our representations also referred to the need to establish a clearer sequence in points i – iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1. It should, therefore, be made clear that the preference in each category will be for the redevelopment of previously developed sites rather than through the release of greenfield land. This installs the proper planning sequence in accordance with national policy.

Alternative Sites

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

Regardless of this over provision and as stated above, national policy includes a strong sequential preference for the best and most effective use of land in urban areas – and especially previously developed land, which should be used before greenfield or undeveloped sites. The adopted development plan and emerging LDP also clearly reference the sequential priority to be given to the effective use of previously developed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| <p>However, all those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes

There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.

3683.K4 Natural Resources Wales 18/10/2013 E O M

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 474/ Bettws Hill

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)032

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Bettws Hill

3 3 Representation
Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside (Greenfield) site*
The proposal would result in piecemeal encroachment into the open countryside contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development.

(See attached information and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material Yes

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,
This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.
If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 475/ Land adj Parkwood Close,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1199.K1 | Giles, Cllr Gail | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 475/ Land adj Parkwood Close

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land adjacent Parkwood Close

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the following applications :

RAS(N)034 - Land adjacent Parkwood Close

On the grounds of due to over development and the subsequent increase in traffic which will contribute to already existing transport and AQM issues in Caerleon town.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 2272.K1 | Singleton, Mike | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|---------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 475/ Land adj Parkwood Close

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)034

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land adjacent Parkwood Close

3 3 Representation

1.RAS(N)034, Parkwood Close.

This application should fail because it requires the site to no longer be countryside or part of the Green Wedge. It contravenes all the following:

Newport UDP sections-

CE2 Green Wedges, development is only permitted if it maintains the openness of the green wedge.

SP6 it is not appropriate to the area and does not respect its character.

SP1- this is not re-using land already developed. Under 3.56 (vii) the new traffic could not be accommodated on existing highways.

Planning Policy Wales-

3.1.2-4 it is not in accordance with the existing UDP.

4.2.2, 4.4.3, 4.8.3, 4.8.13, 4.8.14-16- as above it is contrary to all policy re: open countryside and the Green Wedge

4.9.1-2 this is not re-use.

9.1.1, 9.1.2. as new house building in the open countryside it should be strictly controlled.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2933.K1 | Sullivan, Mr James | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 475/ Land adj Parkwood Close

Summary: Object to proposed site at Parkwood Close

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)034

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land Adjacent Parkwood Close

3 3 Representation

Despite unending objections from residents and councillors alike, the insatiable bulldozer of development has been allowed to slowly but relentlessly gorge its way into the fair face of our tasteful town. Caerleon has oft been hailed as 'the icing on Newport's cake' but we can't have our cake and eat it so, I propose that, in accordance with Newport City Council's policy "to protect the best and natural environment and biodiversity", a Caerleon Zero Development Zone be created which would include, and therefore prevent, all development as per the Alternative LDP Sites Register as it applies to Caerleon.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K2 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|---------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 475/ Land adj Parkwood Close

Summary: Insufficient land is available for vehicular access

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)034 Land adjacent Parkwood Close Caerleon
Insufficient land is available to provide vehicular access. Gradient from Parkwood Close to the site is also too great to provide vehicular access. The site is located in Parking Zone 3.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K5 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 475/ Land adj Parkwood Close

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential use

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)034 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adj. Parkwood Close | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside/Green Wedge (Greenfield) site* This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Green Wedge as set out in the LDP, and undermines the allocation of the area as a Green Wedge, the aim of which is to retain the openness of the area. Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional info and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2. This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4029.K2 | Wall, Mrs Rose | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 475/ Land adj Parkwood Close

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)034

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land adjacent Parkwood Close

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

I wish to object most strongly to the possible inclusion of the above land in the Newport LDP and to any potential development of it for the following reasons:

- I believe it is Newport City Council's strategic policy is to focus on brownfield sites for potential development as need arises. The site above is a greenfield site, so should not be included within the LDP boundary if Newport City Council is to adhere to its own policy.

- I understand that Newport City Council has identified a need for 10,350 new homes to be built in the city by 2025 and that the existing LDP provides enough brownfield sites for 11,622. There is no need for the greenfield site above to be included within the LDP boundary in order for the Council to meet its own target.

- Caerleon is choked by traffic and the centre of the village is dying. Previous councils failed to agree upon a way of creating an additional route in and out of the village to the west via Pillmawr Lane onto the Newport – Cwmbran dual carriageway when it was built. Since then, permission for significant additional housing development off Lodge Road and elsewhere has been granted. These new and existing residents could have avoided driving through the centre of the village, had the opportunity to create a westbound access road been taken advantage of. No potential further development of any kind in Caerleon can be considered until ways of reducing the volume of local and through traffic have been found.

- The current unsustainable volume of heavy traffic in the village has resulted in unacceptably high levels of air pollution being recorded, although crucial measurements have yet to be taken at the narrowest point of the High Street adjacent to The Ffwrwm. Such pollution levels pose a health threat to local residents and to children attending the schools in the centre of the village. No further development of any kind in Caerleon can be considered until ways of reducing the air pollution by reducing the volume of traffic have been found.

- Although there is currently a 20mph speed limit and a weight limit on lorries travelling through the village, neither appears to be enforced. Businesses based in Ponthir regularly use the village as a shortcut from the motorway, as do others, so any development of the site above would increase the volume of contractors' vehicles doing this.

- Since my family moved to Belmont Hill in July 1994, Newport Council has consistently failed to provide or enforce effective traffic calming or speed restrictions on Belmont Hill. Nor has it made any improvements to the highway that provide adequate carriageways for the volume of traffic generated by its use as a rat-run from the motorway, or for the increased traffic-flow caused by repeated residential planning permissions granted in Caerleon. The Council has failed to install traffic lights or a roundabout at the Ship Inn junction to ease congestion. As a result, traffic regularly backs up Belmont Hill as far as Old Hill junction during school rush hours, or between 5-6pm, and often beyond Old Hill junction whenever there is a problem on the M4. Development of any kind in Caerleon would increase traffic on Belmont Hill and exacerbate this problem for motorists and local residents alike.

- Since my family moved to Belmont Hill in July 1994, the Council has consistently failed to provide adequate and safe footpaths for pedestrians on Belmont Hill. Schoolchildren and local residents regularly risk life and limb dodging cars and lorries which ignore the 30mph speed limit and hurtle past them down the hill. Development of any kind in Caerleon would increase traffic volume on Belmont Hill and exacerbate the danger to pedestrians and local residents. In addition, streetlights are randomly turned off by the Council during hours of darkness, despite set hours for this being made public, thus further increasing the hazard for pedestrians.

- Most recently, Newport City Council has allowed Sainsbury's to proceed with the inappropriate development of Caerleon's former Angel Inn into a supermarket. The footprint of the current building far exceeds that of the original application which was presented to residents at the public meeting. The site, adjacent to a busy roundabout and narrow one-way residential street, also poses an obvious hazard to pedestrians. Local residents can therefore have no confidence that Newport City Council is able to restrict any proposed development in the village to that of the original application, or planning approval.

- Despite frequent reports in the media that there is a shortage of new, affordable housing in Britain, Newport has benefitted recently from several extensive housing developments on brownfield sites to suit all budgets, including:

Barratt- Foxglove Meadows, Bettws

Persimmon – Greenacres, Llanwern

Redrow – Mon Bank, Cardiff Road

Taylor Wimpey – City Vizion, Rodney Parade; Lysaght Village; Lydia Beynon Gardens, Langstone.

Other brownfield sites remain undeveloped, so there is absolutely no need for any greenfield site in Caerleon to be allocated for development of any kind in the LDP. Caerleon must remain a village and retain its unique character, separate from Newport.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4128.K2 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 475/ Land adj Parkwood Close

Summary: Built historic comments on Land adj. Parkwood Close.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)034

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adj, Parkwood Close

3 3 Representation
This site falls adjacent to a scheduled ancient monument (MM023 - Lodge Wood Camp). Depending on the nature of development, there is potential to impact on the setting of the monument.

Site,RepnType: 476/ Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1199.K2 | Giles, Cllr Gail | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 476/ Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at NHSOB Rugby Club

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
I object to the following application:

RAS(N)041 - Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Clubs, Caerleon - Allocate part of site for residential development.

On the grounds of due to over development and the subsequent increase in traffic which will contribute to already existing transport and AQM issues in Caerleon town.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2272.K2 | Singleton, Mike | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 476/ Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)041

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club

3 3 Representation

2.041 Newport High School Old Boys.

This application should fail because it is both countryside and part of an environmental space. It contravenes all the following:

Newport UDP sections-

SP6 it is not appropriate to the area and does not respect its character.

SP1- this is not re-using land already developed. Under 3.56 (vii) the new traffic could not be accommodated on existing highways.

Planning Policy Wales-

3.1.2-4 it is not in accordance with the existing UDP.

4.2.2, 4.4.3, 4.8.3, 4.8.13, 4.8.14-16- as above it is contrary to all policy re: open countryside.

4.9.1-2 this is not re-use.

9.1.1, 9.1.2. as new house building in the open countryside it should be strictly controlled.

This area has traditionally been a community asset with public access for healthy activities the loss of which would be a real blow to Caerleon.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2933.K2 | Sullivan, Mr James | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 476/ Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club

Summary: Object to proposed development Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)041

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club, Caerleon

3 3 Representation

Despite unending objections from residents and councillors alike, the insatiable bulldozer of development has been allowed to slowly but relentlessly gorge its way into the fair face of our tasteful town. Caerleon has oft been hailed as 'the icing on Newport's cake' but we can't have our cake and eat it so, I propose that, in accordance with Newport City Council's policy "to protect the best and natural environment and biodiversity", a Caerleon Zero Development Zone be created which would include, and therefore prevent, all development as per the Alternative LDP Sites Register as it applies to Caerleon.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K20 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 476/ Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club

Summary: Comments on proposed residential development at NHSOB Rugby Club

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Immediately adjacent to Afon Llwyd and Afon Llwyd Grassland SINCS. Potential ANG

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K6 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 476/ Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club

Summary: Comments regarding site characteristics and constraints

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)041

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club, Caerleon

3 3 Representation

The proposed alternative site is adjacent to the River Lwyd, which is a tributary of the River Usk SAC. The tributary also supports otters, which are a designated feature of the SAC and EPS[^]. Any application at the proposed alternative site therefore will be need to be the subject of a project level HRA to ensure that the development of the site will not adversely affect the SAC. We advise that this requirement is clearly stated in the Plan. In addition, as part of the LDP process, any allocation at the site will need to be considered as part of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan. The site is located within Zone C2, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the site to be partially within the 1% (1 in 100 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability fluvial flood outlines of the River Lwyd, a designated main river. Our records show that the proposed site has also previously flooded from the River Lwyd ++

Contrary to ToS
C2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|---|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | | Yes |
| <p>^For sites with known potential for EPS: The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP. We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range. We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.</p> <p>++ For sites located within Zone C2: We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2." In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4029.K3 | Wall, Mrs Rose | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 476/ Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)041

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Newport High School Old Boys Rugby Club

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

I wish to object most strongly to the possible inclusion of the above land in the Newport LDP and to any potential development of it for the following reasons:

- I believe it is Newport City Council's strategic policy is to focus on brownfield sites for potential development as need arises. The site above is a greenfield site, so should not be included within the LDP boundary if Newport City Council is to adhere to its own policy.

- I understand that Newport City Council has identified a need for 10,350 new homes to be built in the city by 2025 and that the existing LDP provides enough brownfield sites for 11,622. There is no need for the greenfield site above to be included within the LDP boundary in order for the Council to meet its own target.

- I believe there is a risk of flooding to the site above from the Afon Llwyll would be irresponsible to consider potential development of any kind on the site above.

- Caerleon is choked by traffic and the centre of the village is dying. Previous councils failed to agree upon a way of creating an additional route in and out of the village to the west via Pillmawr Lane onto the Newport – Cwmbran dual carriageway when it was built. Since then, permission for significant additional housing development in Caerleon has been granted. These new and existing residents could have avoided driving through the centre of the village, had the opportunity to create a westbound access road been taken advantage of. No potential further development of any kind in Caerleon can be considered until ways of reducing the volume of local and through traffic have been found.

- The current unsustainable volume of heavy traffic in the village has resulted in unacceptably high levels of air pollution being recorded, although crucial measurements have yet to be taken at the narrowest point of the High Street adjacent to The Ffwrwm. Such pollution levels pose a health threat to local residents and to children attending the schools in the centre of the village. No further development of any kind in Caerleon can be considered until ways of reducing the volume of local and through traffic have been found.

- Although there is currently a 20mph speed limit and a weight limit on lorries travelling through the village, neither appears to be enforced. Businesses based in Ponthir regularly use the village as a shortcut from the motorway, as do others, so any development of the site above would increase the volume of contractors' vehicles doing this.

- Since my family moved to Belmont Hill in July 1994, Newport Council has consistently failed to provide or enforce effective traffic calming or speed restrictions on Belmont Hill. Nor has it made any improvements to the highway that provide adequate carriageways for the volume of traffic generated by its use as a rat-run from the motorway, or for the increased traffic-flow caused by repeated residential planning permissions granted in Caerleon. The Council has failed to install traffic lights or a roundabout at the Ship Inn junction to ease congestion. As a result, traffic regularly backs up Belmont Hill as far as Old Hill junction during school rush hours, or between 5-6pm, and often beyond Old Hill junction whenever there is a problem on the M4. Development of any kind in Caerleon would increase traffic on Belmont Hill and exacerbate this problem for motorists and local residents alike.

- Since my family moved to Belmont Hill in July 1994, the Council has consistently failed to provide adequate and safe footpaths for pedestrians on Belmont Hill. Schoolchildren and local residents regularly risk life and limb dodging cars and lorries which ignore the 30mph speed limit and hurtle past them down the hill. Development of any kind in Caerleon would increase traffic volume on Belmont Hill and exacerbate the danger to pedestrians and local residents. In addition, streetlights are randomly turned off by the Council during hours of darkness, despite set hours for this being made public, thus further increasing the hazard for pedestrians.

- Most recently, Newport City Council has allowed Sainsbury's to proceed with the inappropriate development of Caerleon's former Angel Inn into a supermarket. The footprint of the current building far exceeds that of the original application which was presented to residents at the public meeting. The site, adjacent to a busy roundabout and narrow one-way residential street, also poses an obvious hazard to pedestrians. Local residents can therefore have no confidence that Newport City Council is able to restrict any proposed development in the village to that of the original application, or planning approval.

- Despite frequent reports in the media that there is a shortage of new, affordable housing in Britain, Newport has benefitted recently from several extensive housing developments on brownfield sites to suit all budgets, including:

Barratt- Foxglove Meadows, Bettws

Persimmon – Greenacres, Llanwern

Redrow – Mon Bank, Cardiff Road

Taylor Wimpey – City Vizion, Rodney Parade; Lysaght Village; Lydia Beynon Gardens, Langstone.

Other brownfield sites remain undeveloped, so there is absolutely no need for a greenfield site in Caerleon to be allocated for development of any kind in the LDP. Caerleon must remain a village and

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|---|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| retain its unique character, separate from Newport. | | | | | | | | | | |

Site,RepnType: 477/ Land adj Christchurch,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K2 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: The density of proposed residential development will exceed the theoretical design of the Christchurch WwTW

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site and our local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows. In terms of our Waste Water Treatment Works, we advised that the total density proposed for the site will exceed the theoretical design of our Christchurch WwTW.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1199.K3 | Giles, Cllr Gail | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land adjacent Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)048 - Land adj Christchurch - Allocate site for residential development

On the grounds that it is a greenfield site and there are sufficient brownfield sites to accommodate required house building. It would result in a change of land use and extend the village boundary. Christchurch is a small, distinctive village with its own identity and consisting of narrow, steep roads which will be adversely affected by the additional traffic. Satisfactory access and egress with the required visibility standards for joining a highway, and highway safety, will also be compromised for the same reason.

Blackash Path and Catsash Road are ancient highways that should be protected, as should the ancient woodland in the vicinity

Any effect on drainage will severely affect lower lying properties in particular and it appears the removal of an established hedgerow will be required.

The proposed development will, therefore, be to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area which has previously been described as a Green Wedge and Special Landscape Area.

A precedent has been set with an application that has been refused previously.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2272.K3 | Singleton, Mike | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation 3.048 Christchurch. This huge development should fail because it requires the alteration of the village boundary purely to end the countryside status of the land involved which is completely unacceptable. It contravenes all the following: Newport UDP sections- SP6 it is not appropriate to the area and does not respect its character. SP1- this is not re-using land already developed. Under 3.56 (vii) the new traffic could not be accommodated on existing highways. Planning Policy Wales- 3.1.2-4 it is not in accordance with the existing UDP. 4.2.2, 4.4.3, 4.8.3, 4.8.13, 4.8.14-16- as above it is contrary to all policy re: open countryside. 4.9.1-2 this is not re-use. 9.1.1, 9.1.2. as new house building in the open countryside it should be strictly controlled. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2678.K1 | Taylor, Mrs Mona | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent Christchurch

3 3 Representation

I wish to express my objections to the development for housing at Christchurch between the Black Ash Path and Catsash Road.

In addition to the points made in the attached sheet, may I add the following ones:

- Christchurch to Catsash Road is part of an ancient highway and the old coach road out of Newport. It is lined by ancient hedgerows.
- It is very difficult for traffic to see around the bends in the Catsash Road and there is no pavement. Widening the road to accommodate increased traffic, and also lorries for building work, would have a detrimental effect and destroy the identify of the area.
- The Black Ash Path is ancient and was used by the Romans in Caerleon - it must not be spoilt.
- The ancient woodland around the area should also be conserved as should the defined village area, to keep it separate and prevent it merging with Caerleon.
- I would also draw you attention to the conclusions of the Christchurch Village Study, May 1987 regarding conservation of the distinctive character of Christchurch Village and the open land surrounding it.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | Yes | | | | | | | |
| <p>I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed re their"available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Permitting building on this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village to eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic idnetify from the adjacent Caerleon.2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the areas landscape amenity".3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerows to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be valuable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."4. A development of this site, which is clay based and waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as " A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. | | | | | | | | | | |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2761.K1 | Peters, John and Viv | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality." 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2933.K3 | Sullivan, Mr James | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent Christchurch

3 3 Representation

Despite unending objections from residents and councillors alike, the insatiable bulldozer of development has been allowed to slowly but relentlessly gorge its way into the fair face of our tasteful town. Caerleon has oft been hailed as 'the icing on Newport's cake' but we can't have our cake and eat it so, I propose that, in accordance with Newport City Council's policy "to protect the best and natural environment and biodiversity", a Caerleon Zero Development Zone be created which would include, and therefore prevent, all development as per the Alternative LDP Sites Register as it applies to Caerleon.

(Please see 2 attached photographs which include comments. IMG_1594- 1 shows the proposed development area adjacent to Parkwood Close and LDP PROTEST PIC29639 etx shows the view of the same site from Christchurch)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K24 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Comments on proposed residential development at Land adjacent Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Incursion into open countryside. Hedgerows and adjacent copse provide good connectivity

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K7 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Comments regarding site characteristics and constraints

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent Christchurch

3 3 Representation

Our records indicate that Great Crested Newts, a European Protected Species, may be present in close proximity to the site. We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species[^]
Additionally, any development at the site should retain existing hedgerows at the site to mitigate landscape effects and ensure habitat connectivity.

To meet ToS C2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material Yes

[^]For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3963.K2 | Rudland, Mr Hazel | | | 30/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent Christchurch

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)048

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed development of residential building at Christchurch.

1. There is too much traffic coming down Belmont Hill now, especially if there is a motorway accident, when the rd is blocked solid for hours.

If this development were to go ahead it would only increase the day to day problems of excess traffic.

2. The drainage of this area suffers hugely from the run off from Belmont hill now.
Our drains at the bottom of the hill have been blocked and overflowing for more than 10 years, with no one at the council doing anything about it.

It would be even worse with more houses, and less land up there to soak up heavy rain.

I urge you to refuse this planning application and leave the land at Christchurch to it's rural countryside use.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4003.K1 | Phillips, Mr Wayne | | | 13/09/2016 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development in Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I wish to object to the inclusion of the site at Christchurch being allocated for development in the LDP for the following reasons:

Drainage problems – The natural drainage of this site is toward Old Hill, Ash Well and the old Caerleon village. This area already suffers with substantial rainwater run-off problems from the surrounding fields and even if the development included the introduction of some rain water drainage the construction of domestic properties with paths, sheds etc will inevitably create even greater problems for existing properties in the above areas with rain water run-off from this clay based often waterlogged ground.

More housing would result in an increase in traffic on very narrow roads causing increased hazards for pedestrians and motorists as well as contributing to the queues on Belmont Hill through the Caerleon one way system, or down Royal Oak Hill onto Chepstow Road during rush hours.

This land was previously described as a Special Landscape Area and a Green Wedge in the Unitary Development Plan as late as 2011.

It has a detrimental effect of widening the urban perimeter and beginning the end of the separate identities of Christchurch and Caerleon.

It has an effect on an area of natural beauty – fields, trees, wildlife – enjoyed by not only residents of the village but thousands of others people in Newport and the surrounding area.

Contrast the aspect looking toward Holy Trinity Church from Caerleon with the reverse from Caerleon to Christchurch. The development will be detrimental to the landscape for neighbouring areas such as Llanhenock, Usk Vale, Caerleon and parts of Ponthir.

Development on this site has previously been refused by Newport City Council in 2000 and the reasons for refusal still remain valid today:

It represents an encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality.

Access of Catsash Road will require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety.

This represents the 'thin end of the wedge' having created a precedent it would open up a much larger area for potential development.

The visual qualities of the rural environment would be destroyed and the charm and character of Christchurch village would be lost forever.

I also object to the NCC website being used in as consultaion this is not in the true spirit of this process as the time will elapse with most residents being completely unaware of what's happening.

4004.K1 Horton, Mr Allan

15/09/2013 E O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development in Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I strongly appose any development at Christchurch village. How can any development be proposed or considered when none of the reasons for refusal in the past have changed. I live on Belmont Hill and the traffic has already increased considerably . I have witnessed at least one accident a year so there have been considerably more. On Fridays the traffic is at a standstill from the junction at the Ship, up past the Spice Corner restaurant. How many houses , roads , airports and industrial developments can we cram on this small island.Please stop now.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4005.K1 | Pugh, Mark & Louise | | | 15/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We would like to object to the proposed inclusion of the site into the LDP

We have recently moved to Christchurch and feel a development of this size would significantly change the area. It represents an encroachment into an area of open countryside, and would act to the detriment of the area's rural character and appearance.

Access through Catash road in our opinion would make a small country lane quite dangerous.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4006.K1 | Lawrence, Davinia | | | 16/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I would like to express my objection and concern to the proposed residential development on Old Hill, Christchurch.

I currently live on Belmont Hill, Caerleon and have seen the traffic congestion increase significantly over the last 10 years and have witnessed several serious accidents due to speed and the severity of the bend and feel strongly that it will be a matter of time before there is a fatality on the road. Also with the lack of any clear pavement on Belmont Hill the pedestrian access to Old Hill is particularly dangerous. I therefore see a huge problem with future residential developments adding to this congestion and construction traffic causing traffic chaos.

Alongside this I feel very strongly that all rural character and appearance is being lost from this area with the development of too many residential areas. Resulting in the charm of a rural town being lost forever.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4007.K1 | Walker, Dr Peter | | | 17/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development proposed at Christchurch

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Regarding Site Reference RAS(N)048
Proposed new sites to the existing Revised Deposit

I was shocked to read of the proposed development of land adjacent to Christchurch.

I have lived in this area for almost 50 years and felt every inch of land has been built on.

Every morning and evening it is impossible to enter Caerleon as traffic is stopped half way up Belmont Hill often past the pub/Indian restaurant, new housing would make this even worse. The catchment area would be for Caerleon Comprehensive which is already crowded and the bridge into Caerleon being unable to cope at present, without an increase in traffic.

Old Hill is used by many cars cutting through ,this would no doubt increase the numbers of cars using this route. I personally have almost been knocked down on this road and have met numerous cars going the "wrong way" .

Money has been spent on Old Hill but it is often blocked by fallen trees due to poor drainage/blocked drains.

Catash road is already a death trap to walk and I feel with more traffic a fatality would be inevitable.

I can not envisaged any area where access from the site to the road would be safe.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4008.K1 | Davies, Mr Matthew | | | 17/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to the proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

With reference to the above mentioned Local Development Plan proposal, I Mathew Davies, representing the household of the above mentioned address, wish to register my comments and objections to the addition of this site within the Local Development Plan.

I list below my objections:

1) Contrary to the Newport City Council website, this area has already been declined planning permission a number of times. The most recent of which occurred during October 2000 on the grounds that;

a) The development would encroach onto open countryside and a special landscape area, to the detriment of the rural character, quality and appearance.

b) Access to the site via Catsash Road will require removal of an established hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to comply with the required visibility standards for joining a highway, to the detriment of highway safety.

2) If alternative access is being considered from Old Hill, the current single lane of one way traffic on an extremely steep gradient will present a significant danger to users in addition to the same points raised within objection 1b.

The lane is already a hazard to pedestrians which will be made worse with any further development.

3) The current road infrastructure within the area suffers from a lack of footpaths, most notably those highways bordering the referenced proposal area. Both Catsash Road and Old Hill do not offer footpaths along the highway which will cause a significant hazard to pedestrian residents of any new development.

4) There are currently significant traffic issues during peak periods along Bulmore Road and joining Belmont Hill as commuters travel toward Caerleon. Any further development within the area will compound this issue.

5) The considered area forms part of the route to the Celtic Manor. The resort has brought significant investment to the area and part of its charm and attraction to visitors is due to its rural location. Further development will spoil this attraction.

6) The area suffers from existing drainage problems. Natural drainage is toward Old Hill, Caerleon village and Ash Well. The area already suffers significant rain water runoff issues. Measures already put in place along Old Hill have proven only partly effective. By increasing paved and concreted areas, the situation will only become worse.

7) The land has already been described as a Special Landscape Area and a Green Wedge within the Unitary Development plan as recently as 2011.

8) Christchurch is identified as one of the closest and last remaining outlying villages to the main area of Newport with its own identity and character. This forms a significant part of its charm with visitors to the area attracted by its church, village hall and traditional public house. Further development detracts from this charm to the detriment of the whole local area and tourism, destroying the natural beauty of the area.

9) The area forms one of the last few remaining open areas where wildlife is able to flourish. With a golf course and existing developments situated close by, any reduction in available space will be to the detriment of the local wildlife populations.

10) The local landscape will be blighted by further development as viewed by thousands of visitors to Caerleon each year. The area is viewed clearly from Caerleon and its amphitheatre and forms part of the area's charm.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

In summary, I feel the suggestion to add the above referenced area to the local development plan is ill considered in regard to available infrastructure and is to the detriment of the local community, landscape and character of the existing village.

I encourage this amendment to be declined and actively seek to oppose this potential for development.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4011.K1 | Rookes, Mr Alan J | | | 21/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent to Christchurch

3 3 Representation

The grounds of my objection are primarily the same as the reasons for refusal of previous planning applications on this plot of land and are as follows:
It represents an encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the areas' landscape quality ; and
Access off Catsash Road will require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety.
In addition, I consider that approval of this proposal would effectively be the 'thin edge of the wedge' as developers will see it as an opportunity to seek to develop the whole of the parcel of land bounded by Catsash Road, Belmont Hill and Old Hill and beyond. Such development would greatly spoil the countryside and landscape referred to above.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4013.K1 | Howell, JT & CM | | | 13/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Oppose proposed development in Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

With reference of the proposed building of houses at Christchurch. Our family have lived in Christchurch for over 55 years and feel if this was to go ahead it would be detrimental to this beautiful area, which has already had large dwellings built around the church area. We also have magorconcerns with drainage and vehicles around the village. We need to retain Christchurch as a beautiful village, not almost joining Caerleon. We feel very strongly and with oppose any building in this area.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4020.K1 | Lobim, Ms Lynne | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to the proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4021.K1 | Anderson, Mr D S | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4022.K1 | Covell, Mr & Mrs G D | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4026.K1 | Underwood, Mrs H | | | 30/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to the proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4028.K1 | Edwards, Mr & Mrs G | | | 30/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)048

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4029.K1 | Wall, Mrs Rose | | | 01/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land adjacent Christchurch

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

I wish to object most strongly to the possible inclusion of the above land in the Newport LDP and to any potential development of it for the following reasons:

- The first reason that the planning application for a housing development on the site above was turned down in October 2000 remains as relevant in October 2013. Any development: represents an encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality.

- The second reason that the planning application for a housing development on the site was turned down in October 2000 remains as relevant in October 2013: access of Catsash Road will require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety. The stretch of Catsash Road that runs alongside the site above is single-lane with no passing places. It is therefore too narrow to accommodate access onto a housing or commercial development without destroying its rural character.

- Drainage works to Old Hill and Belmont Hill have not solved long-term problems with rainwater run-off from this clay-based ground during heavy or prolonged rainfall. Development at the top of the hill would exacerbate the problem by reducing the area of ground into which rainwater could soak away.

- Since my family moved to Belmont Hill in July 1994, Newport Council has consistently failed to provide or enforce effective traffic calming or speed restrictions on Belmont Hill. Nor has it made any improvements to the highway that provide adequate carriageways for the volume of traffic generated by its use as a rat-run from the motorway, or for the increased traffic-flow caused by repeated residential planning permissions granted in Caerleon. The Council has failed to install traffic lights or a roundabout at the Ship Inn junction to ease congestion. As a result, traffic regularly backs up Belmont Hill as far as Old Hill junction during school rush hours, or between 5-6pm, and often beyond Old Hill junction whenever there is a problem on the M4. Development of any kind at the top of the hill would increase traffic on Belmont Hill and exacerbate this problem for motorists and local residents alike.

- Since my family moved to Belmont Hill in July 1994, the Council has consistently failed to provide adequate and safe footpaths for pedestrians on Belmont Hill. Schoolchildren and local residents regularly risk life and limb dodging cars and lorries which ignore the 30mph speed limit and hurtle past them down the hill. Development of any kind at the top of the hill would increase traffic volume on Belmont Hill and exacerbate the danger to pedestrians and local residents. In addition, streetlights are randomly turned off by the Council during hours of darkness, despite set hours for this being made public, thus further increasing the hazard for pedestrians.

- Most recently, Newport City Council has allowed Sainsbury's to proceed with the inappropriate development of Caerleon's former Angel Inn into a supermarket. The footprint of the current building far exceeds that of the original application which was presented to residents at the public meeting. The site, adjacent to a busy roundabout and narrow one-way residential street, also poses an obvious hazard to pedestrians. Local residents can therefore have no confidence that Newport City Council is able to restrict any proposed development in Christchurch to that of the original application, or planning approval.

- Any development of the site at Christchurch would represent 'the thin end of the wedge' as, having created a precedent it would open up a much larger area for potential development. This has been the case on the other side of Belmont Hill with the repeated expansion and development of the Celtic Manor into agricultural land and the Usk Valley, which has been to the detriment and inconvenience of existing local residents. Newport City Council has repeatedly proved itself unwilling or unable to restrict or manage this ambitious commercial development, so local residents can therefore have no confidence that Newport City Council is fit to be the guardian of valuable local countryside in Christchurch, should the site be included in the LDP.

- Despite frequent reports in the media that there is a shortage of new, affordable housing in Britain, Newport has benefitted recently from several extensive housing developments on brownfield sites to suit all budgets, including:

Barratt- Foxglove Meadows, Bettws

Persimmon – Greenacres, Llanwern

Redrow – Mon Bank, Cardiff Road

Taylor Wimpey – City Vision, Rodney Parade; Lysaght Village; Lydia Beynon Gardens, Langstone.

Other brownfield sites remain undeveloped, so there is absolutely no need for a rural site of outstanding open countryside in Christchurch village to be allocated for development of any kind in the LDP. Christchurch must remain a village and retain its unique character, separate from Caerleon and Newport.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4030.K1 | Walsh, Mr & Mrs | | | 01/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4035.K1 | Jones, Alan Lynn & Melanie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land adjacent Christchurch

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

I refer to the proposal to change the land referred to in the above plan to allow its use for the development of housing. I object to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Designation of the land under previous Unitary Development Plan (UDG)
- Change of land use
- Highway access
- Extension of village boundary
- Drainage

Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011

Under the above UDG, the land bounded by Catsash Road (now renamed Christchurch Road) / Belmont Hill / Black Ash Path as designated as a :-

- Special Landscape Area
- Green Wedge

The proposed change of use of the land will set a precedent which will eventually result in the whole of the area being developed.

The land provides large numbers of residents in the area of Caerleon, and stretching north towards Pontypool and Abergavenny, with a particularly attractive landscape. The area is visible from many positions on the opposite site of the Usk Valley and the construction of houses on this land would be a blight on the landscape, which would then be spoiled forever.

The green wedge between Christchurch and Caerleon would be compromised by any development and it is clear that if allowed it would eventually result in the green wedge being destroyed, resulting in the two villages becoming merged by unsuitable housing development. This would eventually damage the unique character of Caerleon, which given its history must be protected.

The site has been subject of a number of planning applications in the past. The most recent application in 2000 was rejected because it was said to represent, "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."

Change of Land Use

The land is currently good agricultural land which is being used presently for grazing cattle. Any proposed development would immediately reduce the amount of agricultural land within the City. Sufficient land has been identified in the City for housing developments, without the need to utilise prime Greenfield agricultural sites.

Highway Access

Access to the site will be via Catsash (Christchurch) Road which is in reality a lane with only barely sufficient room to allow two vehicles to pass safely. A drainage ditch running along the same side of the road at the point of access onto the site further narrows the road.

The amount of traffic using this road has increased dramatically in recent years, particularly with the traffic generated by the Celtic Manor since the Ryder Cup in 2010. further traffic and additional access points will make the road, which has no pavements, extremely dangerous for both pedestrians and motorists.

The planning application which was turned down in 2000 included an objection for the Head of Engineering and Transport, which said, "The site is located on the inside of a bend in Catsash Road with visibility severely impaired by an existing hedge. Expresses concern that any proposed access onto Catsash Road will be unable to provide the required visibility splay.

Extension of Village Boundary

The proposed development is outside the Boundary of the village of Christchurch. The village has an attractive layout, with a centre adjacent to a Norman church, a 16th century house and a public house. Clustered around this nucleus are a number of dwellings. Extension of the village boundary into open countryside will be detrimental to the character and pleasing appearance of the village. Any

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

development will result in the enlargement of the village by the extension of the existing settlement, leading to its encroachment onto virgin land.

Drainage

The proposed site is clay based and often waterlogged which could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.

Conclusion

Any development on this site will be detrimental to the appearance, character and future of the villages of Christchurch and Caerleon and the surrounding areas. It will require the use of good agricultural land when there are sufficient numbers of other sites available within the City suitable for housing developments and will significantly increase the risk of road accidents in the area.

It will create a dangerous precedent leading to a further development of the site, resulting in the destruction of an attractive and historic area of the City.

A proposed development of 2 houses was refused by the Council in 2000, and in 1989 the Welsh Office rejected an appeal to build 4 houses on the site for the same reasons detailed above. The reasons for rejections of housing development on this land then, are still valid now and in fact are more so given the potential size of any development and the already increased traffic in the area.

We strongly oppose any development on this land and we urge the Council to refuse the request for it to be designated in the LDP as being suitable for housing development.

I refer to the proposal to change the land referred to in the above plan to allow its use for the development of housing. I have previously submitted a letter of objection to the proposal, but I have since had access to the documents submitted on behalf of Redrow Homes Limited and so I would like my additional comments below to be taken into consideration.

I request that I am allowed to appear at any future Public Examination.

The documents contain a number of inaccuracies, unsupported assumptions, contradictions and untrue statements which I consider should result in the request for an Alternative Site Submission in respect of the land at Christchurch to be rejected. Pages 3 & 4 of the document submitted by Geraint John Planning summarises the overall position put forward in the document. My comments on those are below:-

"Satisfactory highway access can be provided to serve the proposed site and the current highway network is capable /accommodating the proposed traffic movements."

The access onto Catsash Road (recently renamed Christchurch Road) is very narrow and at the point of the proposed access, visibility is poor due to the proximity of bends in both directions. The document quotes a report by Vectos which has made an assumption that the 25 five-bedroom houses will only generate additional 20 vehicles movements during peak rush hours. There is no scientific calculation of this figure; it is a bold unsupported statement which forms the basis of the assumption that there will be no safety issues arising on the road. This clearly does not stand up to scrutiny. Common sense dictates that in a five-bedroom house, which the submission states is in an affluent area of the City, there are likely to be at least two and more likely three cars per household, based on say, two adults (parents) and perhaps one child of college/work age. With people leaving for work/college and school runs it is more likely that there will be at least 3 additional trips per house equating to 75 per hour, or 1 trip approximately every 48 seconds, as opposed to the submission of one vehicle per 3 minutes.

In November 2000, when the Council turned down an application for the construction 2 houses on this site, the then Head of Engineering and Transportation expressed concerns over the location of the access being on a bend with visibility being severely impaired. This situation is unchanged apart from the fact that this proposed development is 12.5 times bigger and the traffic in the area has increased significantly, particularly following the success of the Celtic Manor Ryder Cup in 2010.

"The site is located within close proximity of frequent public transport services."

This is incorrect and misleading on two fronts. Firstly, buses no longer stop outside the Church, but at the View Point, approximately 150 metres further down Christchurch Road, which at one point outside the pub, is on a bend with no pavement. Further, the distance quoted has been measured from the proposed site entrance and does not take into account the distance that pedestrians would have to walk from their houses before reaching the site exit.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

The submission proposes locating a bus stop opposite to the proposed site access. Given the width of the road at this point and the additional traffic generated by the development (as above) this would prove extremely dangerous for pedestrians and motorists.

"The site is accessible to local destinations on foot."

The easiest and safest access to Christchurch village is via the public footpath which runs from Catsash Road through the churchyard. To get to the footpath from the proposed site exit, it is presently necessary to walk for approximately 70 metres along Catsash Road, which has no pavement. The developers propose cutting back the existing hedgerow for a distance of approximately 40 metres and creating a pavement running towards the footpath. They however fail to mention that when the pavement runs out at the private entrance to Rhoslan, it will then be necessary to walk a further 30 metres along the road with no footpath and with a drainage ditch running alongside it.

Further, on reaching the public footpath, access to the facilities at Christchurch is not possible for prams/pushchairs, cyclists or those in disability chairs /scooters as the Church is bounded by 3 narrow "kissing gates" through which only pedestrians on foot can pass.

"The site's location provides an opportunity for residential development which would be neither prominent nor isolated. "

The land was previously designated as a Special Landscape Area. The land provides large numbers of residents in the area of Caerleon, and stretching north towards Pontypool and Abergavenny, with a particularly attractive landscape. The area is visible from many positions on the opposite side of the Usk Valley and the construction of houses on this land would be blight on the landscape, which would then be spoiled forever.

The Welsh Officer Inspector, EC Davies MSc BA FRTPA ARICS, in rejecting an appeal on 26 January 1989, for the construction of 4 dwellings on the site (copy attached) concluded that if the land was developed it, ".....would be seen as protruding into the landscape to the detriment of the visual quality of this outstanding scenic feature."

"The site is at no risk of flooding."

The completely grass covered site is predominately clay. Even now, before any development has taken place, it is possible to see areas of standing water which will be made worse by the construction of houses and tarmac roads and driveways. This could have a significant adverse effect on houses in Old Hill and Old Hill Crescent which are already affected by water running off the land. On pages 5-70/ the document, the Council's strategy of identifying only Brownfield sites for housing development has been blamed for the shortfall in housing developments in recent years.

No regard appears to be given to the severe economic conditions that have prevailed over the last five years and has hit house developers particularly badly.

On pages 9 & 10, the document summarises the "Assessment of the Suitability of the Site for Development." I have addressed a number of the issues below:-

"The site is located within close proximity to the existing settlement of Caerleon."

The site was previously designated as a Green Wedge to separate and maintain the individual characters of the two villages of Christchurch and Caerleon. The Green Wedge between Christchurch and Caerleon would be compromised by any development and it is clear that if allowed it would eventually result in it being destroyed completely, resulting in the two villages becoming merged by unsuitable housing developments. This would eventually damage the unique character of Caerleon, which given its history, must be protected.

" , the development of the site would form a logical parcel of development adjoining Christchurch (and could be considered and presented as appropriate "rounding-off" the existing settlement)."

Far from rounding off the existing settlement, it would be an inappropriate extension into open countryside. The view of the Welsh Officer Inspector, in rejecting an appeal on 26 January 1989, for the construction of 4 dwellings on the site concluded, "that rather than rounding off existing development, the use of land for the erection of 4 dwellings would result in the outward extension of the village...."

"The site is bound on all sides by existing development, highways and mature landscaping - it is therefore enclosed by "defensible" boundaries to all aspects and cannot be considered to be "open countryside"."

This designation as open countryside was considered by the Welsh Officer Inspector in rejecting an appeal for the construction of four dwellings on the site on 26 January 1989. His findings were quite

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

clear, "In my judgement, the area of land concerned does form part of the open countryside."

"the site is not subject to any significant site constraints and would provide a viable and deliverable residential development site."

The houses bounding the southern edge of the site are not connected to mains drainage, relying on cesspits/septic tanks. There is no mention in the document how water and sewage drainage for 25 five-bedroom developments is to be provided. The report by Vectos refers only to the requirement for " ...some upgrading to cater for the proposed residential development."

Page 13 of the document states, "Existing mature trees/ hedgerow around the periphery /the site will be maintained~ which assist in ensuring that the site is visually enclosed."

This is in complete contradiction to the plans to remove the hedgerows to provide the visibility splays for the site entrance and the proposals to provide footpaths at various points around the site.

An Addendum Document provided on behalf of Redrow in support of the proposal provides further perceived advantages of the proposed development. I have commented on the document below:-
The document refers at some length to the impact of good quality housing on economic growth of an area. It however overstates the importance of this amongst the factors important in developing economic growth and the location of inward investment opportunities. Whilst it is accepted that appropriate housing does have some influence it is not nearly as important as:-

- the availability of good communication links
- the availability of a well trained workforce
- the availability of good educational facilities
- links to local universities
- availability of government grants
- etc.

Page 4 of Alternative Site Submission quotes a report by Edge Analytics for Cardiff City Council, "...this means that Newport will continue to play a role in meeting Cardiff's economic functionhousing is required to accommodate those people that move from Cardiff to Newport [to] take advantage of cheaper house prices."

By Redrow's own admission, the development will benefit Cardiff's economy more than Newport's. This could also be applied to Bristol.

The Welsh Officer Inspector in rejecting an appeal for the construction off our dwellings on the site on 26 January 1989 concluded that the economic benefits of providing housing for senior managers on the site, "are significantly outweighed by the harmful effect which the development would have upon the character of the Christchurch/Catsash/Kemys Graig ridge and the setting of Christchurch."

The conclusions to the addendum state, " There is a need for such housing in all areas" and "there is a need in Newport/or the provision of additional such sites..."

A search of the Rightmove website on 11 October (copy attached) showed there to be 95 five-bedroom houses for sale in Newport of which 59 were in the NP18 postal district. This clearly demonstrates that there are adequate houses of this type in Newport without the need to destroy an area of open countryside to provide more.

Linked to the above economic development claim, the present availability of sufficient five-bedroom houses in Newport means that this proposed development will have an almost negligible impact on economic growth in Newport.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-----|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4036.K1 | Harris, Mr Alun Lloyd | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)048

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4038.K1 | Vangasse, Chris E | | | 03/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4039.K1 | , The Owner / Occupier | | | 03/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)048

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4040.K1 | Seels, David J and Helen E | | | 07/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent Christchurch

3 3 Representation

We understand that a consultation has started regarding the LDP for a site at Christchurch, site plan RAS(N)048.

We would object strongly to the inclusion of this site within the LDP for any form of housing. I would refer you to the Christchurch Village Study which was adopted by the then Newport Borough Council on 28th May 1987. The contents of that study are still fully relevant viz:-

Any extension to the Village would involve an undesirable intrusion into prominent open countryside and would adversely affect the distinctive form and character of the village. The village is set in high quality landscape and one which is worthy of stringent protection and conservation. Such action would compliment measures to contain any future growth of the village and to conserve important buildings, structures and other features of interest including prominent trees.

The area is, I understand designated as a Special Landscape Area.

Road access is very limited, dangerous and inadequate.

Main drainage is not available and the dangers of highway and waste drainage to existing dwellings etc must be considerable.

Development has previously been turned down in respect of the site and the reasons are still pertinent.

I trust that the application will be turned down.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4041.K1 | Jenkins, Miss Gwyneth | | | 07/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality." 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4042.K1 | Taylor, Mrs H M | | | 07/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have recently been made aware of the above planning application and would wish to register my objections to this development. My reasons for this objection are underlined below: 1 Car Parking and Road Congestions It would seem from the plans that the proposed development would involve additional traffic to Old Hill and the entrance to Old Hill Crescent. This area is very narrow and is already suffering congestion due to the building work in Old Hill. There is no off road parking in this area and residents of Old Hill already park in Old Hill Crescent. Living at number 1, I am already severely affected by this traffic congestion and often have been unable to exit my drive due to indiscriminate or heavy vehicle parking. In addition it remains of concern that during any building phase that takes place in this area, that works vehicles will have to park in Old Hill Crescent, as there is no space for works vehicles to park safely anywhere near the proposed site This will cause danger and disruption for a period of time. 2 The Effect upon the Environment The encroachment this site and any buildings upon the area of natural beauty will be considerable and will therefore change the nature and impair the quality if this special area. My understanding from the response to previous such applications is that the area has been seen to be a 'green wedge' providing a natural vista and keeping the areas of Christchurch, Newport and Caerleon separate, and providing a natural habitat for flora and fauna. As residents in this area we are already aware of drainage problems and reference to Welsh Water will confirm that they attend Old Hill Crescent with a degree of regularity. Any further strain upon the drainage system would surely result in further problems for residents in this area. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4044.K1 | Evans, Mr Geoffrey | | | 07/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would wish to object to the current proposal that the above site in Christchurch, be changed from Green Belt to allow planning permission to build houses. My objections are as follows. 1. To change the use of this site, for residential development, would set a precedent for possible future land around the village of Christchurch and would change the nature and character of the village. 2. This site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications and each has been rejected. The Council gave valid reasons which still exist for this application. 3. Even buildings 25 new houses would dramatically make even worse the traffic problems on Catsash Road, Belmont Hill, Christchurch Hill and Royal Oak Hill. This is already a dangerous area due to the narrow roads and blind bends and no roadside pavements. 4. The Council stated policy of developing "brown field sites" within the LDP, would not be met if this plan were to go ahead. In turning down past applications the land was described as "A special landscape area" and "Development would require the removal of established hedgerow and spoil the rural character and appearance of the area". |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4045.K1 | Phillips, Donella | | | 07/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed housing development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the inclusion of the land at Christchurch RAS(N)048 in the Local Development Plan for the following reasons: This is a green field site and does not comply with the overarching brown field strategy for housing development. Newport needs around 10,500 new homes and the current LDP already caters for around 11,600 new houses, so the inclusion of a greenfield site is not necessary in this case. I would like to propose a further amendment to the LDP to be that this site is designated as green belt and not available for house building in perpetuity. Please could you keep me informed of the ongoing process regarding this matter and the Council's Planning Committee recommendation to the Planning Inspectorate (Wales) for its review. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4050.K1 | Prosser, VJ & AJ | | | 09/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality." 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4051.K1 | Perkins, LY & A | | | 09/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality." 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4052.K1 | Lewis, B | | | 09/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality." 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4053.K1 | Perry, Mrs O A | | | 09/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality." 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4056.K1 | Beese, Lydon & Christine | | | 10/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality." 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4061.K1 | Reynolds, PJ & D | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent Christchurch

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and , as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4063.K1 | Purnell, Mr & Mrs J S | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent Christchurch

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this can be changes to the "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.
2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality."
3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Castash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays requires in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."
4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.
5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.
6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".
7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4066.K1 | Blackburn, Mr & Mrs | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed re their "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building on this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village to eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the areas landscape amenity". 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerows to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be valuable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4068.K1 | Morris, Salli | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed re their "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building on this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village to eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the areas landscape amenity". 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerows to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be valuable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4069.K1 | Murray, Mr Gareth | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed re their "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building on this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village to eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape amenity". 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerows to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be valuable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4070.K1 | Grieve, Robert & Jillian | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation This is to register our objections to the additions of the Alternative Site referenced above to the LDP. Hereunder is a summary of our primary objections following our review of the Representor's proposals submitted for the Revised Deposit LDP Consultation. •The proposed Site is currently utilized as agricultural land, directly adjacent to Christchurch. If approved, the proposal would result in a loss of Greenfield land to development - in direct conflict with the Sustainability Appraisal objective and Newport City Council's (NCC) Adopted Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011. •Specifically, proposed development at the Site would violate the NCC's Sustainability Appraisal Objective - "to ensure the efficient use of land and the protection of geo diversity, soil quality and mineral resources." •The proposed development would have a negative effect on the local valued landscape; in part as a result of the new priority junction access from Catsash Road. The new access will cause harm to the visual amenity of the wider landscape: To achieve the appropriate visibility splays of 2.4m and 43m onto Catsash Road, existing hedgerows tree belts and hedgerows trees must be removed. Moreover, a proposed improved pedestrian environment to facilitate travel between the site and the centre of the village (Church and Pub) would significantly increase the dangers to a carriage with no specific pedestrian or cycle provisions. •Proposed new bus stops installed on a 5.5m road - adjacent to the site access will cause major traffic disruption. •Contamination resulting from the development of residential housing on the Greenfield land is acknowledged (by the Proponent) as a possibility: The development of residential housing on the site which is clay based and (already) frequently waterlogged is likely to cause serious drainage problems to existing surrounding properties. •The proposed site; located approximately 1km south of an SSSI and SAC designation does not include environmental protections designations. •The site is not located in or near an area of deprivation. •NCC anticipates a Brownfield strategy with a requirement for enough land for 10,350 homes. In fact, enough land has already been allocated for 11,622 homes. The Greenfield site at Christchurch is not needed and is certainly not supported by the Alternative Site Representations to the Revised Deposit LDP Consultation. We respectfully request that the Christchurch Site (Ref RAS(N)048) be omitted from NCC's proposed submission of the LDP to the Welsh Government. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4071.K1 | Coles, Mr & Mrs | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to the suggested site on Land at Christchurch.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent to Christchurch. |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed re their "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building on this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village to eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the areas landscape amenity". 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerows to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be valuable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4080.K1 | , The Owner / Occupier | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)048 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent Christchurch |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed re their "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons: 1. Permitting building on this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village to eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon. 2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the areas landscape amenity". 3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerows to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be valuable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety." 4. A development of this site, which is clay based and waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties. 5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill. 6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge". 7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4082.K1 | Morgan, Mr & Mrs | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to the alternative site suggested at Christchurch.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Christchurch

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed to that "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.

2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent:

"An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality".

3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will:

"Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."

4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.

5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.

6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".

7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4083.K1 | Kenny, Ms Carole | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land adjacent Christchurch

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed re their "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building on this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village to eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.

2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape amenity".

3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will:

"Require the removal of an established area of hedgerows to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be valuable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."

4. A development of this site, which is clay based and waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.

5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.

6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".

7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4084.K1 | Davies, Ms Helen | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land adjacent Christchurch

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed re their "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building on this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village to eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.

2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the areas landscape amenity".

3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will:

"Require the removal of an established area of hedgerows to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be valuable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."

4. A development of this site, which is clay based and waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.

5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.

6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".

7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4085.K1 | Jones, Mr Simon | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land adjacent Christchurch

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed re their "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building on this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village to eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.

2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent: "An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape amenity".

3. In October 2000 it was also stated, and still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will: "Require the removal of an established area of hedgerows to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be valuable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety."

4. A development of this site, which is clay based and waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.

5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal Oak Hill.

6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".

7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4099.K1 | Shroff, D | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to proposed development at Christchurch

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

As a resident of Old Hill Crescent, Christchurch, I hereby wish to object to the proposal for the above site to be changed to "available for development" for housing.

The site is unsuitable for development for the following reasons:

1. The area of the site as marked on the plan is so large that it would mean that the village of Christchurch would not simply be enlarged, but approximately doubled in size. This effectively amounts to creating an entirely new village.
 2. The site has been the subject of previous planning applications, all of which have been refused. The grounds for refusal are still valid today; for example:
it encroaches into an area of open countryside and special landscape area, to the detriment of its rural character and quality;
access is only available from Catsash Road, but this would require the removal of established hedgerows, to the detriment of the rural character and visual amenity of the area;
there is insufficient space to allow for the visibility splays required by adopted standards for highway safety.
 3. The 2011 Unitary Development Plan stipulated that the area was "A Special Landscape Area" and a "Green Wedge".
 4. There is already an ample supply of brownfield sites which are designated for housing development and are far more suitable. Permitting development on the Christchurch site is contrary to the City Council's stated policy that brownfield sites should be developed in priority to greenfield .
-

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4108.K1 | Donovan, Mr Gary | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land adjacent Christchurch

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

I have lived at Christchurch for 26 years and am very sorry to see there is yet another attempt to build on the site designation RAS(N)048. This site has been the centre of a number of planning applications over the years I have lived here. Many attempts have been made to destroy the village of Christchurch with applications to build on this site, I find it sickening that you can keep attempting to get permission to build on a site despite the number of times it has been turned down for very valid reasons which stand today more than ever, due to the increased traffic etc, I have documentary evidence of previous applications and I can only assume that the plan is to keep submitting applications until they eventually succeed.

I understand the plan is to make entrances on Catsash Rd and Old Hill to this site.

I cannot believe anyone could expect to put an entrance on Old Hill for the following reasons

The top of Old Hill has just had 2 new houses built on the site of Step Cottage, these houses grossly over populate this site, with single drives so short they cannot park a car in the drive without sticking out onto the pavement, already we see cars parked on the double yellow lines outside. These houses prevent any change to the width of this very narrow road!

Old Hill is a restricted single track road (residents only) and has a No Entry sign a short distance from the top, is very narrow and winding and is a road of extreme beauty used by lots of walkers, this proposed entry to RAS(0)048 will destroy this.

Catsash is a narrow winding road which has the bus service and heavy traffic running along it! And will as it stands not support an entrance to the site.

It should be remembered that this application is only a pilot application and if passed will lead to further applications for the whole of the land which is bordered by Belmont Hill, any entrance to this site would have to feed the complete area of RAS(N)048 and the rest of the developed field.

There have been many houses for sale in the surrounding area which have been very slow to move with a lot failing to sell and being removed from the market so there is no justification for these extra houses.

This application is not to improve the area around Christchurch is an attempt to fulfil the greed of those wishing to develop it and destroying Christchurch in the process.

What has happened to the area being given special status as a Conservation Area (see Argus May 14 1987)

Please consider the following points about Christchurch

Narrow roads and heavy traffic passing Christchurch

The ground drops away steeply from the existing village of Christchurch.

See Christchurch Village Study released by Newport council in May 1987 this application is a total departure from this

As late as 2011 the area was described in the unitary development plan as A special Landscape area.

Any attempt as this to increase the village boundary should be rejected as once allowed will never be stopped.

All the evidence held by the council about previous rejected applications should still be considered and viewed as still valid.

Please do not destroy the natural beauty and wildlife of Christchurch which is the reason why most of us live here

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4110.K1 | Davies, Adam and Rhowen | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 477/ Land adj Christchurch

Summary: Object to the suggested site at Christchurch.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)048

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Christchurch.

3 3 Representation

I would like to object to the current proposal that this site can be changed to that "available" for development in the LDP for housing. I submit my objection for the following reasons:

1. Permitting building in this site will set a precedent for future development on the green areas surrounding Christchurch which would ultimately change the nature and character of this unique village and eliminate its existing separate, idiosyncratic identity from the adjacent Caerleon.

2. The site has already been the subject of a number of planning applications in previous years and, as recently as October 2000, an application was rejected because it was said to represent:

"An encroachment into an area of open countryside and a special landscape area to the detriment of its rural character and appearance and the area's landscape quality".

3. In October 2000 it was stated, and is still the current situation, that access from Catsash Road will:

"Require the removal of an established area of hedgerow to the detriment of the rural character and appearance of the area and will be unable to provide the visibility splays required in accordance with adopted standards to the detriment of highway safety".

4. A development of this site, which is clay based and often waterlogged, could cause drainage problems for surrounding properties.

5. The surrounding access roads are very narrow and already hazardous; hence more housing in this area would inevitably result in increased traffic congestion and associated danger to existing residents. Increased motorists in a new housing development would also, of course, exacerbate the ever-increasing problem of traffic queues on Belmont Hill and Royal oak Hill.

6. In 2011 the land was described in the Unitary Development Plan as "A Special Landscape Area" and "A Green Wedge".

7. The site and area is enjoyed and utilised by residents and countless visitors from Newport and further afield for its inherent "natural" beauty as a place of fields, trees and wildlife. Any development in this "green" space would destroy forever such precious habitats.

Site,RepnType: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 42.K1 | Graig Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

My Council wish to strongly object to the inclusion of the following three sites proposed for the Graig Ward as they are considered to be 'Special Landscape Areas', infrastructure and facilities would not be able to support further development in the area, and currently Newport has ample supply within its boundaries to satisfy demand and future needs.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 583.K7 | Cornelious, Cllr Mrs Margaret | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|--------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I do not believe that the Pentrepoeth site should be redesignated from a special landscape area when Newport has more than sufficient brownfield sites available, as per their policies. Pentrepoeth Road is strangely a single track rural road, with some housing. This could not easily be widened to accommodate multiple housing. Bassaleg School, one of the largest comprehensive schools in Wales is already oversubscribed by children living locally. Pentrepoeth School also. The A468, M4 are already oversubscribed at peak times, and extra traffic would cause a problem each weekday morning it takes around 1/2 hour to do barely 2 miles. This would be made much worse, as the Novelis site comes into being and compounded by extra traffic from Bassaleg. For all the above reasons, I think it is imperative that Pentrepoeth is not redesignated and built on.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 693.K1 | Menzies, Miss H E | | | 24/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Object to proposed development at Pentrepoeth

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number AS(N)040 [RAS(N)021] | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Pentrepoeth | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation The local road structure is over used and could not sustain further congestion with an increase in housing. All local schools are at capacity and would not be able to increase the number of students new homes would create. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 694.K1 | Caston, Mr R J | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Objects to inclusion of this site for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)021 (former ref. 65.C2) |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land off Pentrepoeth Road |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I object to the inclusion of this site (for residential development) in the Revised Local Plan, for the following reasons: - (1) There is sufficient 'brownfield' land to the West of Newport to meet projected needs. (2) The site access from local roads is very poor. Pentrepoeth Road itself is narrow, with considerable on-road parking outside properties with no parking facilities of their own. It is a "safe route to school", with considerable pedestrian school traffic. In addition, it is a listed cycle route, well used; also considerable amounts of horse riders use it. On the other side of the site, Penylan Road is, again, part of a "safe route to school", and becoming increasingly used as a through route to Cardiff to avoid congestion on A468/A48/M4. I should add that, in the vicinity of this site, Pentrepoeth Road has no pavements. (3) Although neglected by it's owners, the site is prime farmland, as evidenced by it's previous use as a market garden and nursery. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 985.K2 | Raybould, Mr Allan | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We strongly support the current designation of this area as a Special Landscape Area and Countryside and oppose the proposal to incorporate it within the urban area. We also strongly oppose the proposal to allocate this land for residential development.

(i) The area is part of a valuable area of countryside separating Cardiff and Newport and priority should be given to preserving it. We support this strategy for practical and amenity reasons. The amount of countryside between the cities is finite and irreplaceable. We should not accept any incremental erosion of this by opportunistic developers whose sole motive is the pursuit of short term profit.

(ii) The revised deposit LDP makes ample provision for housing for the foreseeable future, largely on brownfield sites, making this proposal completely unnecessary.

(iii) The local infrastructure is not adequate to cater for further residential development at any scale let alone at the huge scale proposed. Local schools are already full and educationally beyond their optimum size. The transport system is clearly inadequate. Pentrepoeth Road itself is too narrow and in any places cannot be widened. Neither Pentrepoeth Road nor Pen y Lan have pavements. The former, in particular is used by many pedestrians including children of secondary, primary and nursery ages. These roads are effectively narrow country lanes and are hazardous with existing traffic levels. Significantly increasing traffic levels would be unthinkable on safety grounds.

(iv) Forge Road gives access to Junction 28 of the M4 for traffic from the Gwent valleys. Rhymney Valley and the villages of Bassaleg and Rhiwderin. This road along with Caerphilly Road through Bassaleg already constitute one of the most heavily congested areas in Wales (BBC Radio Wales traffic reports confirm this). Adding housing on the scale proposed would greatly increase the volume of traffic and drastically worsen and already dire situation.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2159.K1 | Bazzard, R | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number |
| | | RAS(N)021 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name |
| | | Land off Pentrepoeth Road |
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
| | | <p>I wish to object to the inclusion of the following alternative sites being included into the proposed Local Development Plan (Revised Stage)</p> <p>Land off Pentrepoeth Road [site ref:RAS(N)021], The Griffin Bassaleg RAS(N)024 Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin RAS(N)030</p> <p>The grounds for my objection are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Newport City Council has published the Revised Deposit version of the Local Development Plan, this document clearly outlines the housing needs of county and demonstrates how this will be achieved. Therefore if this plan is deemed to be sound, then alternative sites should not be considered. I refer to the recent report published by Robert Mellor, the inspector appointed by Welsh Ministers to review the Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council's Local Development Plan, in this he clearly states in item 1.4 that if the plan is "sound" then alternative sites should not be considered as it is not the role of an inspector to make a sound plan better. The area is considered to be "Special Landscape Areas in the Countryside" and there are numerous other sites that have already been identified within the Deposit Plan without this level of designation, therefore these site should not be reconsidered. I note that I believe they where submitted for inclusion in LDP, but have not been deemed suitable for inclusion. The facilities / amenities will not be able to support further development in the area and I believe that currently Newport has an ample supply of land within its boundaries to satisfy demand and the future needs without further burdening an already stretched infrastructure. For example: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The road network between Bassaleg School and the M4 junction 28 is already heavily congested, and the proposed alternative sites will over load the road network. School facilities are not of sufficient size to cope with the increased influx. GP services are already stretched with excessive waiting times for appointments. Damage to the wonderful wild life both Bird and animal, Flora and Fauna. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3269.K3 | Thomas, Mr Geoff | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Object to proposed development at Pentrepoeth Road

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)021 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Pentrepoeth |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Reference your letter dated 6 August 2012 I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. I acknowledge that you require responses to be on separate pro formas in respect of each site but I find this difficult and as my representations are in respect of the sites in Graig Ward and my comments are identical in respect of each, I hope you will find the email contact appropriate. I have identified the suggested new sites as best as I can from your website as follows :- As[N]010 the Griffin As[N]040 Pentrepoeth Redrow As[N]042 Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth Also Glochwen Rhiwderin With the partial exception of the Griffin which includes an element of Leisure, Education and Open Space all the suggested sites are for residential development. I have supported the Council's Preferred Strategy in their draft LDP and I would wish to object to these Alternative Sites. My grounds for objection are :- 1 All the proposals are for development on greenfield sites. The LDP for good and obvious reasons wishes to promote development where practicable on brownfield sites. It makes the point that there is a sufficiency of brownfield sites. 2 The proposals would have an overwhelming effect on the present local road system, already frequently fully saturated. The bottleneck of the adjacent M4/J28 access is a critical point and I have little doubt that the overloaded conditions will continue notwithstanding the proposed improvement to this interchange. There seems little point in underlining factors of which the Council will already be aware such as the proximity of Basaleg school and the already approved additional housing development at the former golf course. 3 There would be a similar effect on both utility services such as sewerage where surcharging already takes place at the junction of Laurel Road and Caerphilly Road and social services such as medical [provision for the area is at Rogerstone] and education where I understand local school population is near or at capacity. With regard to the proposals for Amendment to Countryside Special Landscape Areas I strongly feel that these were defined in the Draft LDP for cogent reasons which I fully support. The only purpose for proposals to amend/remove them would be to facilitate future development.. I therefore wish to object to them for the same reasons outlined above together with my view that these areas warrant protection of the highest order. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3276.K1 | and Family, Peter Symes | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Object to proposed development at Pentrepoeth Road

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I object to all the proposed additions, amendments, and Deletions especially the proposed changes to the old Tredegar Park Golf course site.

I realise that the site owners will always have an eye for a chance to renege on their previously-agreed commitments but they have no firm grounds to wriggle out of these environmental conditions rightly imposed when planning permission was granted (unfortunately) in the first place.

Nothing has changed in the interim except there is an even greater need to protect the environment in Graig and ensure we have some green space and places to walk safely.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3349.K1 | McClelland, David & Julia | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Object to proposed site at Land off Pentrepoeth Road

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)021 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land off Pentrepoeth Road |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

I wish to object to the inclusion of the following alternative site being included into the proposed Local Development Plan (Revised Stage).

Land off Pentrepoeth Road [site ref RAS(N)021],

The grounds for my objection are;

1. Newport City Council has published the Revised Deposit version of the Local Development Plan, this document clearly outlines the housing needs of county and demonstrates how this will be achieved. Therefore is this plan is deemed to be sound, then alternative sites should not be considered. I refer to the recent report published by Robert Mellow, the inspector appointed by Welsh Ministers to review the Rhondda Cynon Taf County Boroughs Council's Local Development Plan, in this he clearly states in item 1.4 that is the plan is "sound" then alternative sites should not be considered as it is not he role of an inspector to make a sound plan better.

2. The area is considered to be "Special Landscape Areas in the Countryside" and there are numerous other sites that have already been identified within the Deposit Plan without this level if designation, therefore these sites should not be reconsidered. I note that I believe they were submitted for inclusion in LDP, but have not been deemed suitable of inclusion.

3. The facilities/amenities will not be able to support further development in the area and I believe that currently Newport has an ample supply of land within its boundaries to satisfy demand and the future needs without further burdening an already stretched infrastructure. For example:

a. The road network between Bassaleg School and the M4 junction 28 is already heavily congested, and the proposed alternative sites will over load the road network.

B. School facilities are not of sufficient size to cope with the increased influx.

C. GP services are already stretched with excessive waiting times for appointments.

On the same grounds I further object to the proposed amendments of Special Landscape Areas/Countryside/Settlement Boundaries detailed below.

| | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3399.K2 | Raybould, Ms Marilynne | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We strongly support the current designation of this area as a Special Landscape Area and Countryside and oppose the proposal to incorporate it within the urban area. We also strongly oppose the proposal to allocate this land for residential development.

(i) The area is part of a valuable area of countryside separating Cardiff and Newport and priority should be given to preserving it. We support this strategy for practical and amenity reasons. The amount of countryside between the cities is finite and irreplaceable. We should not accept any incremental erosion of this by opportunistic developers whose sole motive is the pursuit of short term profit.

(ii) The revised deposit LDP makes ample provision for housing for the foreseeable future, largely on brownfield sites, making this proposal completely unnecessary.

(iii) The local infrastructure is not adequate to cater for further residential development at any scale let alone at the huge scale proposed. Local schools are already full and educationally beyond their optimum size. The transport system is clearly inadequate. Pentrepoeth Road itself is too narrow and in any places cannot be widened. Neither Pentrepoeth Road nor Pen y Lan have pavements. The former, in particular is used by many pedestrians including children of secondary, primary and nursery ages. These roads are effectively narrow country lanes and are hazardous with existing traffic levels. Significantly increasing traffic levels would be unthinkable on safety grounds.

(iv) Forge Road gives access to Junction 28 of the M4 for traffic from the Gwent valleys. Rhymney Valley and the villages of Bassaleg and Rhiwderin. This road along with Caerphilly Road through Bassaleg already constitute one of the most heavily congested areas in Wales (BBC Radio Wales traffic reports confirm this). Adding housing on the scale proposed would greatly increase the volume of traffic and drastically worsen and already dire situation.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3467.K3 | Williams, Cllr David | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I wish to have the following comments added

- 1 Sufficient land is available now that the Alcan site is being developed.
- 2 The road infrastructure is inadequate for an increase in development in the ward
- 3 Bassaleg school is already full.
- 4 Forge lane and the Risca Bypass are already snarled up at peak times
- 5 The sites are within a special landscape area which needs to be preserved.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3520.K4 | Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited | Savills | | 26/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)021

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Pentrepoeth Road

3 3 Representation

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

Yes

Savills is instructed, on behalf of Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited ('Walters'), to make comments on Newport Council's 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Alcan/Novelis factory site (now known as Jubilee Park) was granted on 10 August 2013. In this time, considerable work has been done by Walters to allow land reclamation and remediation works to start on site. Alongside this work, Walters has also submitted to the Council a reserved matters application for the first phase of infrastructure and landscaping works. All this activity and momentum is very positive and reinforces their commitment to Jubilee Park and its future development in the plan period.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP and Revised Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations provide the context to our comments on the proposed 'Alternative Sites'. There is significant alignment between Walters' ambitions for the site and the content of the emerging LDP and, on this basis, much of what was said to the Deposit Plan(s) is positive and supportive. However, there were some areas of the plan that we consider can and should be improved and these are carried forward in our representations to the 'Alternative Sites'.

The main concern in these representations relate to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over the plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations.

Jubilee Park is allocated under Policy H1(54), which is identified to deliver nearly 925 new homes (although the outline consent allows up to 1,200) within the plan period.

The draft plans' strategic policies, Policy SP1(ii), makes it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction – a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Jubilee Park, remains a priority throughout the plan period. This priority gives those committed brownfield sites an opportunity to deliver the housing proposed without releasing excess land that is not required to meeting need during the plan period. As such, we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be released only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The representations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than the Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The figure that the sites summarised under parts i – iv of their policy comes to nearly 12,000, which is substantially more land than is required and, on the face of it, is a significant and unnecessary contingency.

If there is doubt about performance, the allocations under Policy H1 are so large (with the possibility of delivering more) that, even with the removal of the greenfield releases both the 7,500 figure and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. Therefore, the reasonable approach, which was set out in our representations would be to reserve any greenfield sites for release at a later stage of the plan (if required at all). In this regard, our representations also referred to the need to establish a clearer sequence in points i – iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1. It should, therefore, be made clear that the preference in each category will be for the redevelopment of previously developed sites rather than through the release of greenfield land. This installs the proper planning sequence in accordance with national policy.

Alternative Sites

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

Regardless of this over provision and as stated above, national policy includes a strong sequential preference for the best and most effective use of land in urban areas – and especially previously developed land, which should be used before greenfield or undeveloped sites. The adopted development plan and emerging LDP also clearly reference the sequential priority to be given to the effective use of previously developed sites.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

However, all those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | Yes |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|

There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| 3683.K8 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | | M |
|----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 478/ Land off Pentrepoeth Road

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential use

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number |
|---|---|-----------------------------|

RAS(N)021

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name |
|---|---|-----------------------|

Land off Pentrepoeth Road

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Open Countryside(Greenfield) site*

This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas as set out in the LDP.

Contrary to ToS
C2, CE1, CE2.

(See additional information and hyperlink)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | Yes |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | No |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|----|

Site,RepnType: 479/ The Griffin,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 42.K2 | Graig Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at The Griffin

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

My Council wish to strongly object to the inclusion of the following three sites proposed for the Graig Ward as they are considered to be 'Special Landscape Areas', infrastructure and facilities would not be able to support further development in the area, and currently Newport has ample supply within its boundaries to satisfy demand and future needs.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 182.K2 | The National Trust | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|--------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at The Griffin

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

S(N)024 The Griffin

This is a repeat of alternative site representations ASA10, ASA20, ASA21 and ASA22. As set out in our objections to those representations, we consider that development of this site has the potential to harm the setting of the grade II* registered Tredegar Park and scheduled ancient monument of Y Gaer. We therefore consider that the site should not be included in the urban boundary. We also consider that it should remain subject to countryside and special landscape area designations.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 583.K5 | Cornelious, Cllr Mrs Margaret | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|--------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at The Griffin

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I feel this site should definitely not be designated from special landscape area, and used for building houses. If built on, it would cause significant traffic problems; being adjacent to one entrance to Bassaleg school which is already very congested at coming and going school times. This lane is also very narrow and largely single track beyond Bassaleg School. It is heavily used as a rat run to access the A48, M4 and could be very dangerous with extra traffic. Generally in this area the A468 is very congested especially at peak times, also Forge Lane which is normally, especially on school days a continuous queue from Bassaleg Roundabout to the M4. As stated before, the schools are already oversubscribed, and alternatives are not easily accessed on public transport. I feel this area should not be developed, as it would spoil the rural aspect of this part of Bassaleg.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 693.K2 | Menzies, Miss H E | | | 24/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Object to proposed development at the Griffin

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number AS(N)010 [RAS(N)024] | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name The Griffin | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation This land is not suitable for the purposes outlined in the alternative development plan. The road structure would not be able to cope with the extra traffic. The sports club that has been offered this land is only situated 2 miles away, and is well established in the local community, if this move happened it would be detrimental to the local community as the road and public transport services would not allow the current number of members to attend the new club. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 694.K2 | Caston, Mr R J | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objects to allocation of this site for residential/leisure/educational development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)024 (former ref. 1666.C1) | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at the Griffin, Bassaleg. | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I object to the inclusion of this site (for residential/leisure/educational development) in the Revised Local Plan for the following reasons:- (1) There is sufficient 'brownfield' land to the West of Newport to meet projected needs. (2) The site access from Penylan Road is poor. It is adjacent to a main entrance to Bassaleg Comprehensive School, used daily by hundreds of children. Penylan Road is increasingly used as a through route to Cardiff, as motorists avoid the increasingly congested A468/A467/M4 etc. routes. (3) The site is productive farmland, in current use as such. (4) It represents intrusion in the countryside, outside the built environment. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 985.K3 | Raybould, Mr Allan | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at The Griffin

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We strongly support the current designation of this area as a Special Landscape Area and Countryside and oppose the proposal to allocate this land for residential development. The urban boundary should not be adjusted as proposed.

(i) This area is part of a valuable area of countryside separating Cardiff and Newport and priority should be given to preserving it. We support this strategy for practical and amenity reasons. The amount of countryside is finite and irreplaceable and we should not accept any incremental erosion of this by opportunistic developers whose sole motive is the pursuit of short term profit.

(ii) The revised deposit LDP makes ample provision for housing for the foreseeable future, largely on brownfield sites, making this proposal completely unnecessary.

(iii) The local infrastructure is not adequate to cater for further residential development at any scale, let alone at the huge scale proposed. Local schools are not only already full but are beyond their optimum size educationally. The road system locally is inadequate. Pen y Lan is a relatively narrow country road, largely without pavements and which is regularly used by pedestrians, particularly secondary school children. Pen y Lan is undoubtedly hazardous to pedestrian at present and any increase in traffic would inevitably exacerbate this situation.

(iv) Caerphilly Road in Bassaleg leads onto Forge Road and hence to the M4 and Newport / Cardiff. It is demonstrably one of the most heavily congested roads in Wales, where long queues at peak times are the norm. to allow extensive housing development to go ahead would be to plan to make an already dire situation substantially worse.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2159.K2 | Bazzard, R | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)024

2 2 Alternative Site Name
The Griffin

3 3 Representation

I wish to object to the inclusion of the following alternative sites being included into the proposed Local Development Plan (Revised Stage)

Land off Pentrepoeth Road [site ref:RAS(N)021],
The Griffin Bassaleg RAS(N)024
Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin RAS(N)030

The grounds for my objection are;

1. Newport City Council has published the Revised Deposit version of the Local Development Plan, this document clearly outlines the housing needs of county and demonstrates how this will be achieved. Therefore if this plan is deemed to be sound, then alternative sites should not be considered. I refer to the recent report published by Robert Mellor, the inspector appointed by Welsh Ministers to review the Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council's Local Development Plan, in this he clearly states in item 1.4 that if the plan is "sound" then alternative sites should not be considered as it is not the role of an inspector to make a sound plan better.
2. The area is considered to be "Special Landscape Areas in the Countryside" and there are numerous other sites that have already been identified within the Deposit Plan without this level of designation, therefore these site should not be reconsidered. I note that I believe they where submitted for inclusion in LDP, but have not been deemed suitable for inclusion.
3. The facilities / amenities will not be able to support further development in the area and I believe that currently Newport has an ample supply of land within its boundaries to satisfy demand and the future needs without further burdening an already stretched infrastructure. For example:
 - a. The road network between Bassaleg School and the M4 junction 28 is already heavily congested, and the proposed alternative sites will over load the road network.
 - b. School facilities are not of sufficient size to cope with the increased influx.
 - c. GP services are already stretched with excessive waiting times for appointments.
 - d. Damage to the wonderful wild life both Bird and animal, Flora and Fauna.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3269.K1 | Thomas, Mr Geoff | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed development at The Griffin

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)024 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name The Griffin |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Reference your letter dated 6 August 2012 I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. I acknowledge that you require responses to be on separate pro formas in respect of each site but I find this difficult and as my representations are in respect of the sites in Graig Ward and my comments are identical in respect of each, I hope you will find this email contact appropriate. I have identified the suggested new sites as best as I can from your website as follows :- As[N]010 the Griffin As[N]040 Pentrepoeth Redrow As[N]042 Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth Also Glochwen Rhiwderin With the partial exception of the Griffin which includes an element of Leisure, Education and Open Space all the suggested sites are for residential development. I have supported the Council's Preferred Strategy in their draft LDP and I would wish to object to these Alternative Sites. My grounds for objection are :- 1 All the proposals are for development on greenfield sites. The LDP for good and obvious reasons wishes to promote development where practicable on brownfield sites. It makes the point that there is a sufficiency of brownfield sites. 2 The proposals would have an overwhelming effect on the present local road system, already frequently fully saturated. The bottleneck of the adjacent M4/J28 access is a critical point and I have little doubt that the overloaded conditions will continue notwithstanding the proposed improvement to this interchange. There seems little point in underlining factors of which the Council will already be aware such as the proximity of Basaleg school and the already approved additional housing development at the former golf course. 3 There would be a similar effect on both utility services such as sewerage where surcharging already takes place at the junction of Laurel Road and Caerphilly Road and social services such as medical [provision for the area is at Rogerstone] and education where I understand local school population is near or at capacity. With regard to the proposals for Amendment to Countryside Special Landscape Areas I strongly feel that these were defined in the Draft LDP for cogent reasons which I fully support. The only purpose for proposals to amend/remove them would be to facilitate future development.. I therefore wish to object to them for the same reasons outlined above together with my view that these areas warrant protection of the highest order. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3276.K2 | and Family, Peter Symes | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Object to proposed development at The Griffin

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I object to all the proposed additions, amendments, and Deletions especially the proposed changes to the old Tredegar Park Golf course site.

I realise that the site owners will always have an eye for a chance to renege on their previously-agreed commitments but they have no firm grounds to wriggle out of these environmental conditions rightly imposed when planning permission was granted (unfortunately) in the first place.

Nothing has changed in the interim except there is an even greater need to protect the environment in Graig and ensure we have some green space and places to walk safely.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3349.K2 | McClelland, David & Julia | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Object to proposed site at The Griffin

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)024

3 3 Representation

I wish to object to the inclusion of the following alternative site being included into the proposed Local Development Plan (Revised Stage).

The Griffin Bassaleg (RAS(N)024

The grounds for my objection are;

1. Newport City Council has published the Revised Deposit version of the Local Development Plan, this document clearly outlines the housing needs of county and demonstrates how this will be achieved. Therefore is this plan is deemed to be sound, then alternative sites should not be considered. I refer to the recent report published by Robert Mellow, the inspector appointed by Welsh Ministers to review the Rhondda Cynon Taf County Boroughs Council's Local Development Plan, in this he clearly states in item 1.4 that is the plan is "sound" then alternative sites should not be considered as it is not he role of an inspector to make a sound plan better.

2. The area is considered to be "Special Landscape Areas in the Countryside" and there are numerous other sites that have already been identified within the Deposit Plan without this level if designation, therefore these sites should not be reconsidered. I note that I believe they were submitted for inclusion in LDP, but have not been deemed suitable of inclusion.

3. The facilities/amenities will not be able to support further development in the area and I believe that currently Newport has an ample supply of land within its boundaries to satisfy demand and the future needs without further burdening an already stretched infrastructure. For example:

- a. The road network between Bassaleg School and the M4 junction 28 is already heavily congested, and the proposed alternative sites will over load the road network.
- B. School facilities are not of sufficient size to cope with the increased influx.
- C. GP services are already stretched with excessive waiting times for appointments.

On the same grounds I further object to the proposed amendments of Special Landscape Areas/Countryside/Settlement Boundaries detailed below.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3399.K3 | Raybould, Ms Marilynne | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at The Griffin

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We strongly support the current designation of this area as a Special Landscape Area and Countryside and oppose the proposal to allocate this land for residential development. The urban boundary should not be adjusted as proposed.

(i) This area is part of a valuable area of countryside separating Cardiff and Newport and priority should be given to preserving it. We support this strategy for practical and amenity reasons. The amount of countryside is finite and irreplaceable and we should not accept any incremental erosion of this by opportunistic developers whose sole motive is the pursuit of short term profit.

(ii) The revised deposit LDP makes ample provision for housing for the foreseeable future, largely on brownfield sites, making this proposal completely unnecessary.

(iii) The local infrastructure is not adequate to cater for further residential development at any scale, let alone at the huge scale proposed. Local schools are not only already full but are beyond their optimum size educationally. The road system locally is inadequate. Pen y Lan is a relatively narrow country road, largely without pavements and which is regularly used by pedestrians, particularly secondary school children. Pen y Lan is undoubtedly hazardous to pedestrian at present and any increase in traffic would inevitably exacerbate this situation.

(iv) Caerphilly Road in Bassaleg leads onto Forge Road and hence to the M4 and Newport / Cardiff. It is demonstrably one of the most heavily congested roads in Wales, where long queues at peak times are the norm. To allow extensive housing development to go ahead would be to plan to make an already dire situation substantially worse.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3467.K1 | Williams, Cllr David | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at The Griffin

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I wish to have the following comments added

- 1 Sufficient land is available now that the Alcan site is being developed.
- 2 The road infrastructure is inadequate for an increase in development in the ward
- 3 Bassaleg school is already full.
- 4 Forge lane and the Risca Bypass are already snarled up at peak times
- 5 The sites are within a special landscape area which needs to be preserved.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3520.K5 | Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited | Savills | | 26/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)024

2 2 Alternative Site Name
The Griffin, Bassaleg

3 3 Representation

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | Yes | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--|

Savills is instructed, on behalf of Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited ('Walters'), to make comments on Newport Council's 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Alcan/Novelis factory site (now known as Jubilee Park) was granted on 10 August 2013. In this time, considerable work has been done by Walters to allow land reclamation and remediation works to start on site. Alongside this work, Walters has also submitted to the Council a reserved matters application for the first phase of infrastructure and landscaping works. All this activity and momentum is very positive and reinforces their commitment to Jubilee Park and its future development in the plan period.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP and Revised Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations provide the context to our comments on the proposed 'Alternative Sites'. There is significant alignment between Walters' ambitions for the site and the content of the emerging LDP and, on this basis, much of what was said to the Deposit Plan(s) is positive and supportive. However, there were some areas of the plan that we consider can and should be improved and these are carried forward in our representations to the 'Alternative Sites'.

The main concern in these representations relate to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over the plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations.

Jubilee Park is allocated under Policy H1(54), which is identified to deliver nearly 925 new homes (although the outline consent allows up to 1,200) within the plan period.

The draft plans' strategic policies, Policy SP1(ii), makes it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction – a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Jubilee Park, remains a priority throughout the plan period. This priority gives those committed brownfield sites an opportunity to deliver the housing proposed without releasing excess land that is not required to meeting need during the plan period. As such, we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be released only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The representations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than the Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The figure that the sites summarised under parts i – iv of their policy comes to nearly 12,000, which is substantially more land than is required and, on the face of it, is a significant and unnecessary contingency.

If there is doubt about performance, the allocations under Policy H1 are so large (with the possibility of delivering more) that, even with the removal of the greenfield releases both the 7,500 figure and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. Therefore, the reasonable approach, which was set out in our representations would be to reserve any greenfield sites for release at a later stage of the plan (if required at all). In this regard, our representations also referred to the need to establish a clearer sequence in points i – iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1. It should, therefore, be made clear that the preference in each category will be for the redevelopment of previously developed sites rather than through the release of greenfield land. This installs the proper planning sequence in accordance with national policy.

Alternative Sites

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

Regardless of this over provision and as stated above, national policy includes a strong sequential preference for the best and most effective use of land in urban areas – and especially previously developed land, which should be used before greenfield or undeveloped sites. The adopted development plan and emerging LDP also clearly reference the sequential priority to be given to the effective use of previously developed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| <p>However, all those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | Yes | |
| <p>There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K3 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Not a sustainable location for proposed use.

Item Question Representation Text

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation | | | | | | | | |
| <p>RAS(N)024 The Griffin Bassaleg Penylan Road is narrow and will require widening to provide adequate carriageway width and footway/cycleway which will require extensive loss of hedgerow. The site is more 400 metres to the nearest bus stop which is greater than the standard minimum distance. The site is located in Parking Zone 6. Transport Assessment required. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K9 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 479/ The Griffin

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)024 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name The Griffin |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Open Countryside(Greenfield) site* This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas as set out in the LDP. Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Site,RepnType: 480/ Gloch Wen,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 42.K3 | Graig Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Gloch Wen

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

My Council wish to strongly object to the inclusion of the following three sites proposed for the Graig Ward as they are considered to be 'Special Landscape Areas', infrastructure and facilities would not be able to support further development in the area, and currently Newport has ample supply within its boundaries to satisfy demand and future needs

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 583.K6 | Cornelious, Cllr Mrs Margaret | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|--------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Gloch Wen

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the re-designation from special landscape area. Newport has the Eastern Expansion Zone, already designated for housing also the ex Novelis Site. They are both brown-field sites which more than meet Newport statutory need for housing. We should not be building on open countryside sites when we have adequate other sites.
 If built on, this site would use the A468 and Forge Lane to access the M4. At peak times these roads are already clogged taking anything up to 30 mins for a 2 mile journey. Forge Lane would also be affected by the Novelis development and sites using Forge Lane to access M4.
 Both Pentrepoeth and Bassaleg schools are already oversubscribed. It is a long way with no suitable bus route to other schools. Bassaleg School is one of the largest comprehensive in Wales, and cannot reasonably be expanded.
 With the Gloch Wen site, if it was to exit into Harlech Drive Rhiwderin, this would involve using the level crossing (to access A468). This would not be safe for vastly improved traffic. Trains still use this late. There are no medical facilities, few sports area. Rhiwderin could not cope with the increase in housing. The development would also mean that Rhiwderin would be joined to Rogerstone, and all green space would be lost.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 694.K3 | Caston, Mr R J | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Objects to allocation of this site for residential development

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)030 (was 2072.C2) | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Gloch Wen/Land to north of Harlech Drive | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I object to the inclusion of this site, (for residential development) in the Revised Local Plan for the following reasons:- (1) There is sufficient "brownfield" land to the West of Newport to meet projected needs. (2) It represents intrusion into open countryside, outside the built environment. (3) The site is productive farmland, in use as such. (4) The access to the site can only be described as tortuous, culminating in a sub-standard access to the busy A468 Caerphilly-Newport road, over a railway level crossing. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 742.K1 | Smith, Mr G D | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Oppose development at Gloch Wen

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)030 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Gloch Wen | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Glochwen: Housing developments on a site of this size will totally overwhelm the area. All services are already stretched - drainage, road traffic, schools primary and secondary. What is the justification for more new houses? | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1615.K1 | Rothon, Mr Geoff | | | 11/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Object to the suggested site at Gloch Wen

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)030 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Glochwen | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I object to the above proposed addition due to extra traffic flow with only one road in & out of Rhiwderin village. Too many near misses have already occurred due to the over population of the village already. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2159.K3 | Bazzard, R | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)030 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Gloch Wen |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I wish to object to the inclusion of the following alternative sites being included into the proposed Local Development Plan (Revised Stage) Land off Pentrepoeth Road [site ref:RAS(N)021], The Griffin Bassaleg RAS(N)024 Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin RAS(N)030 The grounds for my objection are; 1. Newport City Council has published the Revised Deposit version of the Local Development Plan, this document clearly outlines the housing needs of county and demonstrates how this will be achieved. Therefore if this plan is deemed to be sound, then alternative sites should not be considered. I refer to the recent report published by Robert Mellor, the inspector appointed by Welsh Ministers to review the Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council's Local Development Plan, in this he clearly states in item 1.4 that if the plan is "sound" then alternative sites should not be considered as it is not the role of an inspector to make a sound plan better. 2. The area is considered to be "Special Landscape Areas in the Countryside" and there are numerous other sites that have already been identified within the Deposit Plan without this level of designation, therefore these site should not be reconsidered. I note that I believe they where submitted for inclusion in LDP, but have not been deemed suitable for inclusion. 3. The facilities / amenities will not be able to support further development in the area and I believe that currently Newport has an ample supply of land within its boundaries to satisfy demand and the future needs without further burdening an already stretched infrastructure. For example: a. The road network between Bassaleg School and the M4 junction 28 is already heavily congested, and the proposed alternative sites will over load the road network. b. School facilities are not of sufficient size to cope with the increased influx. c. GP services are already stretched with excessive waiting times for appointments. d. Damage to the wonderful wild life both Bird and animal, Flora and Fauna. |

- a. The road network between Bassaleg School and the M4 junction 28 is already heavily congested, and the proposed alternative sites will over load the road network.
- b. School facilities are not of sufficient size to cope with the increased influx.
- c. GP services are already stretched with excessive waiting times for appointments.
- d. Damage to the wonderful wild life both Bird and animal, Flora and Fauna.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3269.K2 | Thomas, Mr Geoff | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Object to proposed development at Gloch Wen

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)030 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Gloch wen |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Reference your letter dated 6 August 2012 I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. I acknowledge that you require responses to be on separate pro formas in respect of each site but I find this difficult and as my representations are in respect of the sites in Graig Ward and my comments are identical in respect of each, I hope you will find this email contact appropriate. I have identified the suggested new sites as best as I can from your website as follows :- As[N]010 the Griffin As[N]040 Pentrepoeth Redrow As[N]042 Penylan Road, Pentrepoeth Also Glochwen Rhiwderin With the partial exception of the Griffin which includes an element of Leisure, Education and Open Space all the suggested sites are for residential development. I have supported the Council's Preferred Strategy in their draft LDP and I would wish to object to these Alternative Sites. My grounds for objection are :- 1 All the proposals are for development on greenfield sites. The LDP for good and obvious reasons wishes to promote development where practicable on brownfield sites. It makes the point that there is a sufficiency of brownfield sites. 2 The proposals would have an overwhelming effect on the present local road system, already frequently fully saturated. The bottleneck of the adjacent M4/J28 access is a critical point and I have little doubt that the overloaded conditions will continue notwithstanding the proposed improvement to this interchange. There seems little point in underlining factors of which the Council will already be aware such as the proximity of Basaleg school and the already approved additional housing development at the former golf course. 3 There would be a similar effect on both utility services such as sewerage where surcharging already takes place at the junction of Laurel Road and Caerphilly Road and social services such as medical [provision for the area is at Rogerstone] and education where I understand local school population is near or at capacity. With regard to the proposals for Amendment to Countryside Special Landscape Areas I strongly feel that these were defined in the Draft LDP for cogent reasons which I fully support. The only purpose for proposals to amend/remove them would be to facilitate future development.. I therefore wish to object to them for the same reasons outlined above together with my view that these areas warrant protection of the highest order. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3276.K3 | and Family, Peter Symes | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Object to proposed development at Gloch Wen

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I object to all the proposed additions, amendments, and Deletions especially the proposed changes to the old Tredegar Park Golf course site.

I realise that the site owners will always have an eye for a chance to renege on their previously-agreed commitments but they have no firm grounds to wriggle out of these environmental conditions rightly imposed when planning permission was granted (unfortunately) in the first place.

Nothing has changed in the interim except there is an even greater need to protect the environment in Graig and ensure we have some green space and places to walk safely.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3349.K3 | McClelland, David & Julia | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Object to proposed site at Gloch wen

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I wish to object to the inclusion of the following alternative site being included into the proposed Local Development Plan (Revised Stage).

Gloch Wen, Rhwiderin (RAS(N)030

The grounds for my objection are;

1. Newport City Council has published the Revised Deposit version of the Local Development Plan, this document clearly outlines the housing needs of county and demonstrates how this will be achieved. Therefore is this plan is deemed to be sound, then alternative sites should not be considered. I refer to the recent report published by Robert Mellow, the inspector appointed by Welsh Ministers to review the Rhondda Cynon Taf County Boroughs Council's Local Development Plan, in this he clearly states in item 1.4 that is the plan is "sound" then alternative sites should not be considered as it is not he role of an inspector to make a sound plan better.

2. The area is considered to be "Special Landscape Areas in the Countryside" and there are numerous other sites that have already been identified within the Deposit Plan without this level if designation, therefore these sites should not be reconsidered. I note that I believe they were submitted for inclusion in LDP, but have not been deemed suitable of inclusion.

3. The facilities/amenities will not be able to support further development in the area and I believe that currently Newport has an ample supply of land within its boundaries to satisfy demand and the future needs without further burdening an already stretched infrastructure. For example:

- a. The road network between Bassaleg School and the M4 junction 28 is already heavily congested, and the proposed alternative sites will over load the road network.
- B. School facilities are not of sufficient size to cope with the increased influx.
- C. GP services are already stretched with excessive waiting times for appointments.

On the same grounds I further object to the proposed amendments of Special Landscape Areas/Countryside/Settlement Boundaries detailed below.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3467.K2 | Williams, Cllr David | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Gloch Wen

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I wish to have the following comments added

- 1 Sufficient land is available now that the Alcan site is being developed.
- 2 The road infrastructure is inadequate for an increase in development in the ward
- 3 Bassaleg school is already full.
- 4 Forge lane and the Risca Bypass are already snarled up at peak times
- 5 The sites are within a special landscape area which needs to be preserved.

3514.K1 Murray, Mr Steve

13/09/2013

P

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Object to proposed site at Gloch Wen.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)030

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Gloch Wen

3 3 Representation

1. Area is Countryside and Specail Landsacoe area.
2. Map does not take into account mature trees and Hedgerows.
3. Housing land for next 15 years in Newport does not require Green Belt land to be used.
4. Identified traffic problems already in existence.
5. Schools now full to overflowing.
6. In my humble opinion, developers in question, use bullying tactics to obtain results.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3520.K6 | Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited | Savills | | 26/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)030

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin

3 3 Representation

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

Savills is instructed, on behalf of Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited ('Walters'), to make comments on Newport Council's 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Alcan/Novelis factory site (now known as Jubilee Park) was granted on 10 August 2013. In this time, considerable work has been done by Walters to allow land reclamation and remediation works to start on site. Alongside this work, Walters has also submitted to the Council a reserved matters application for the first phase of infrastructure and landscaping works. All this activity and momentum is very positive and reinforces their commitment to Jubilee Park and its future development in the plan period.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP and Revised Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations provide the context to our comments on the proposed 'Alternative Sites'. There is significant alignment between Walters' ambitions for the site and the content of the emerging LDP and, on this basis, much of what was said to the Deposit Plan(s) is positive and supportive. However, there were some areas of the plan that we consider can and should be improved and these are carried forward in our representations to the 'Alternative Sites'.

The main concern in these representations relate to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over the plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations.

Jubilee Park is allocated under Policy H1(54), which is identified to deliver nearly 925 new homes (although the outline consent allows up to 1,200) within the plan period.

The draft plans' strategic policies, Policy SP1(ii), makes it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction – a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Jubilee Park, remains a priority throughout the plan period. This priority gives those committed brownfield sites an opportunity to deliver the housing proposed without releasing excess land that is not required to meeting need during the plan period. As such, we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be released only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The representations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than the Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The figure that the sites summarised under parts i – iv of their policy comes to nearly 12,000, which is substantially more land than is required and, on the face of it, is a significant and unnecessary contingency.

If there is doubt about performance, the allocations under Policy H1 are so large (with the possibility of delivering more) that, even with the removal of the greenfield releases both the 7,500 figure and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. Therefore, the reasonable approach, which was set out in our representations would be to reserve any greenfield sites for release at a later stage of the plan (if required at all). In this regard, our representations also referred to the need to establish a clearer sequence in points i – iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1. It should, therefore, be made clear that the preference in each category will be for the redevelopment of previously developed sites rather than through the release of greenfield land. This installs the proper planning sequence in accordance with national policy.

Alternative Sites

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

Regardless of this over provision and as stated above, national policy includes a strong sequential preference for the best and most effective use of land in urban areas – and especially previously developed land, which should be used before greenfield or undeveloped sites. The adopted development plan and emerging LDP also clearly reference the sequential priority to be given to the effective use of previously developed sites.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

However, all those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | Yes |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|

There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| 3663.K4 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | | M |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Transport Assessment required

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

RAS(N)030 Gloch Wen Rhiwderin
Transport Assessment to determine the effect on the Caerphilly Road junction in terms of capacity and safety. Site is located in Parking Zone 4.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| 3673.K13 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | | M |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Comments on proposed residential development at Gloch Wen

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

Includes area of Ancient Semi Natural Woodland and hedgerow habitat. Incursion into open countryside.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K10 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential use

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)030 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Gloch Wen | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Open Countryside(Greenfield) site* This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas as set out in the LDP. Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| | | *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4128.K3 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 480/ Gloch Wen

Summary: Historic Environment Comments on Gloch Wen

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)030

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Gloch Wen

3 3 Representation
This site is adjacent to a grade II listed building (3092 - Gloch Wen Farmhouse). Development is likely to adversely affect the rural setting of the farmhouse.

Site,RepnType: 481/ A449, Former Depot,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1395.K1 | Atwell, Cllr David | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name A449, Former Depot | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Would like to speak on all sites from attached list that are included in LDP should comment be ignored. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1396.K1 | Atwell, Mrs Carole | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name A449, Former Depot | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1623.K1 | Celtic Manor Resort | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for Gypsy and Traveller transit site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name

A449 Former Depot

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3 3 | Representation | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>This submission is made on behalf of Celtic Manor Resort, in response to the consultation on the Alternative Sites Register Consultation dated September 2013. The A449 Former Depot site (Site Reference RAS(N)008) is included in the Alternative Sites Register as a result of representations made against other proposed G&T Transit sites. These representations have taken the form of proposed deletions of other sites and reference to the A449 site as an alternative or in the form of proposals to allocate the A449 site and delete others. The end result of both types of representations is the same and this response is in objection to all of those representations, as listed below:</p> <p>1062.L2/5.30/Gene Proposed new site at A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park. Llewellyn-Jones, Mrs C M</p> <p>3029.L1//H16.01 Objection to Hartridge Farm Road Gypsy and Travellers Site because of proposed use as health centre, flood risk and SINC. Williams, Mr Dafydd</p> <p>3692.L3//General Propose new site, A449, for Gypsy and Traveller site. Lawrence, Tracey</p> <p>3725.L4//General Proposed two alternative transit Gypsy and Traveller sites at A449 and Tredegar Park Caravan Club. Moulton, Mr Kevin</p> <p>3742.L3//General Use of A449 site as Gypsy and Traveller. Davies, Mr Alan</p> <p>3742.L1//H15.01 Objection to the G&T site in Celtic Way, Coedkernew. Davies, Mr Alan</p> <p>3754.L1//H15.01 Objection to proposed gypsy site at Celtic Way Mr Gethyn Ellis E</p> <p>&</p> <p>3754.L2//H15.01 Propose use of A449 as an alternative to the site proposed at Celtic Way. , Mr Gethyn Ellis E</p> <p>3764.L1//H15.01 Objection to the Gypsy site proposed at Celtic Way Coedkernew. Cameron-Wilton, C J E</p> <p>3765.L1//H15.01 Objection to the Gypsy and Traveller at Celtic Way propose site at A449. Giles, Mr Rhys W</p> <p>&</p> <p>3765.L2//H15.01 Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller transit site at Celtic Way. Giles, Mr Rhys W</p> <p>3769.L4//General Propose two sites, A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park, as alternative to Gypsy and Traveller site at Celtic Way. Prescott, Cecil</p> <p>3807.L1//H15.01 Objection to the Celtic Way Site. Gainey, Miss T</p> <p>3809.L1//H15.01 Object to the G&T site allocation at Celtic Way, Coedkernew. Clements, Mr Adrian E</p> <p>3815.L1//H15.01 Objection to proposed Transit Gypsy site at Celtic Way. Smith, Mr Albert P</p> <p>&</p> <p>3815.L3//General Proposed alternative transit Gypsy site at A449. Smith, Mr Albert</p> <p>3820.L3//General Propose two new alternative Transit Gypsy and Traveller sites at A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park. Perry, A</p> <p>&</p> <p>3820.L1//H15.01 Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller transit site at Celtic Way. Perry, A P</p> <p>3821.L1//H15.01 Objection to proposed transit Gypsy and Traveller site at Celtic Way. Rundle, Ms & Mr R</p> <p>3826.L3//General Proposed alternative transit Gypsy site at A449 and Tredegar Park Caravan Club, Baynham, P A & C A</p> <p>&</p> <p>3826.L3//General Proposed alternative transit Gypsy site at A449 and Tredegar Park Caravan Club, Baynham, P A & C A</p> <p>3828.L3//General Proposed two new sites at A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of the proposed site at Celtic Way. Dickinson, Mr G</p> <p>3832.L3//General Propose two alternative sites A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of Celtic Way transit site. Evans, G T & L E</p> <p>3833.L3//General Proposed two sites at A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of site at Celtic Way. Jones, Mr G</p> <p>3834.L3//General Propose two new sites A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of site at Celtic Way. Barrall, Mr Michael</p> <p>&</p> <p>3834.L3//General Propose two new sites A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of site at Celtic Way. Barrall, Mr Michael</p> <p>3853.L3//General Propose two new sites A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of site proposed at Celtic Way. Thomas, Mr Anthony</p> <p>3854.L3//General Proposed two new sites A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of site proposed at Celtic Way. Gill-Randall, Dr Rachael</p> <p>3855.L3//General Propose two new sites A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park as alternative site to Celtic Way. Owen, Mr Alun Clive</p> <p>3856.L3//General: Propose two alternative sites at A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of site at Celtic Way. Roberts, Mr Dennis</p> <p>3857.L3//General Propose two new sites at A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of the proposed site at Celtic Way. Hughes, J R</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3858.L3//General Propose two new alternative sites at A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park instead of site at Celtic Way. Thomas, Dilys & Gareth

3862.L1//H15.01 Objection to Celtic Way Transit Site. Lambert Smith Hampton E

3867.L1//H15.01 Objection to Celtic Way Site. Jacobs, Mr Duncan E

3879.L3// Propose two new sites as Gypsy and Traveller accommodation at A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park. Parry, M & C

3880.L3//General Propose two new sites, A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park, as alternatives to site proposed at Celtic Way. Davies, Ryan & Sophie

3881.L3//General Propose to new sites at A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park as an alternative to site proposed at Celtic Way.

Perrott, Mr & Mrs

3885.L1//H16.01 Object to Gypsy and Traveller site allocated in the LDP. Mills, Ms Michelle

3983.L2//H15. Petition (signatures and letter) objecting to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Coedkernew. Petition of 174 signatures

3898.L1//H15 Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Celtic Way by Jones Lang LaSalle on behalf of Mrs Baddeley

3920.L3//General Propose new site, A449, as alternative Gypsy and Traveller site to that proposed at Celtic Way. Treharne, Helen & David

3937.L2//General Propose new Gypsy and Traveller site at A449 as alternative to Celtic Way. Colwill, Mr & Mrs P D

3979.L3//General Propose two new sites, A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park, as an alternative to site proposed at Celtic Way. Thomas, Mrs A

3980.L3//General Propose two sites, A449 and Tredegar House Caravan Park, as an alternative to the site at Celtic Way. Harley-Saxton, Mrs J

3983.L4//General Propose alternative Gypsy and Traveller site at A449 and comment on suitability of Tredegar House Caravan Park.

Petition of 174 signatures Coedkernew/Duffryn Residents Group

As all the above representations were primarily submitted in objection to other G&T sites there were comments made criticising these other sites but this response is purely concerned with the A449 site. The points made by all of the above representations in support of the allocation of the A449 site are summarised as follows:

i. NCC own the site.

ii. It is the preferred location for the Travelling community

iii. Offers a safer environment for the traveller community

iv. Proximity to main travel routes

v. The A449 slip road objection can be overcome as with big events with variable speed limits introduced during the arrival of Travellers. Gypsies have to contact the Council before turning up so this Traffic Management would not be necessary every day.

vi. Of suitable size to accommodate a transit site if approached from the opposite direction to that suggested initially by the council.

vii. Allow closer integration with the local community

viii. The site was dismissed due to concerns by the Celtic Manor. An individual companies concerns should not outweigh the majority, no matter what financial benefits they provide.

ix. It is already fenced and gated and has limitations for expansion by unauthorised encampments

x. It would have minimal impact on local commercial and residential properties.

xi. Schools in the area have vacancies. Education is a regulatory and moral right for traveller children.

xii. Lower level of impact in placing the transit site at the A449 site.

xiii. The A449 is rural and not so populated

xiv. It has existing mains services

xv. Its location would not encourage people to stay beyond their allotted time.

xvi. The site is not prominent

The Celtic Manor Resort extends to some 1,400 acres adjoining the former highway depot off the A449 and, as such is directly affected by any proposals for the site, unlike any of those above who submitted representations.

The A449 depot site is owned by Newport Council and is located on Bulmore Road, just past where it runs under the A449 and proceeds North-east adjacent to the southern side of the A449.

This split level site is approximately 6,000sq.m. with the first half running adjacent to and level with most of the length of the slip road leaving the A449. The A449 itself rises above the site and it is very open to views from passing motorists. The first part of the site is a hard surfaced highway storage area in a very prominent and open location.

The second half includes a fenced highway yard used for the storage of salt stocks and lies above the level of the A449. The area to the north of the site is covered in trees but the yard area itself is very visible from both Bulmore Road and the A449. The area to the south of the yard is also tree covered but is within the proposed site area and would have to be cleared of trees and undergrowth.

It is acknowledged that where there is an unmet need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the area and that the LPA are required to allocate sufficient sites in their LDP to ensure that the need for residential and transit use can be met. The LPA must demonstrate that the sites are suitable and have a realistic likelihood of being developed.

As the site is owned by the Council and has mains services there is no reason to question the likelihood of it being developed but, that is not reason alone to allocate it as stated by the representations above (i) & (xiv) and there are many other sites owned by the Council with mains services.

Applying the criteria as set out in the Welsh Government Circular 30/2007: 'Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites' and the 'Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites in

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

Wales, July 2009,' the site is considered completely unsuitable for a number of reasons, despite the above comments:

1. Proximity to hazard – The site is not safe as claimed by the above representations (iii). An assessment carried out by officers of the Council, using the above criteria, has previously concluded that the site's the proximity to the A449 is itself a hazard sufficient to rule it out from further consideration. The above comments ignore the danger to children that the sites proximity to the A449 would cause. It is anything but a safe environment.
2. Vehicular access to the site/Highway danger – A primary concern is the access and egress to the site. None of the representations (iii) & (iv) mention that access on a day to day basis would be via either Bulmore Road or Abernant Road, both narrow, single track roads with very few passing places. These roads are poorly maintained and are single track with passing places too small to cater for a van towing a caravan. Travellers visiting the site will have to drive for a number of miles along lanes that are unsafe and unsuitable for caravans. The lanes have a 60 mile per hour speed limit and there are many near misses already where people drive too quickly. There are serious concerns about safety of the residents if large vehicles, towing caravans driven by individuals unfamiliar with the roads are routinely trying to get down them.
3. Public transport links – The site is inaccessible by public transport and as such is an unsustainable location, isolated from the local community, local facilities and schools (vii) & (xi). The site is remote from the local community and would allow no integration whatsoever (vii). The rural, isolated location (xiii) is seen by some representations as a positive factor but isolation of Travellers is not conducive to an integrated community.
4. Proximity to major roads –For transit sites, close proximity to major roads (A48/A449) is essential in order that it is convenient to use by Travellers (iv). Although the site is alongside the A449, the junction was developed for the Ryder Cup and is kept permanently closed by WAG and cannot be used for access or egress from the A449. Therefore the site can only be accessed via narrow lanes such as Bulmore Road a number of miles from the A449. CMR has requested that the slip road be opened but has been refused by WG and WG have stated that they would not agree to open it to serve a transit site. WG are committed to the provision of G&T sites and even so have considered that the opening up of the slip roads is unacceptable. Condition 2 of the planning permission for the slip roads (06/1662) prevents the use of the slip roads for any other purpose than selected events at the CMR. Representations have suggested that traffic management could be put in place each time Travellers visit the site. This would be both costly, impractical with Council highway officials having to wait for the arrival of the gypsy family and it would still be dangerous to users of the A449. When an event takes place there is considerable advance warning so that drivers are aware of the variable speed limits being imposed but this would not be the case with a visiting Gypsy family. Even if a traffic management solution was put in place for Travellers when they first arrive and then leave the site, whilst they are residing there they would use narrow local lanes to leave and return to the site.
5. Visual impact - The landscape to the north of the River Usk has been assessed using the Landmap methodology as being of a high quality and it must be protected. The site is not only in the open countryside but, because of the landscape quality of the area, is also protected by being designated as part of the Special Landscape Area. No development is allowed in the Special Landscape Area that would harm its appearance, such as a transit site. The farmed landscape is characterised by rolling pasture and arable fields with a strong network of hedges, woodland and scrub with open views across the Usk Valley. It is not characterised by the prominent location of caravans surrounded by a high security fence. Without this expansive countryside setting the Celtic Manor Resort would lose its inherent attraction and is therefore very protective of this sensitive landscape. The yard and hard surfaced area of the proposed transit site would partially be an eyesore even with the site partially covered in trees but, its use as a Gypsy and Traveller transit site will mean that all the site will have to be cleared and will appear more incongruous and more of an eyesore in this high quality landscape (vi), (xii) & (xvi). Because of its dangerous location abutting the A449 there would have to be a security fence to prevent children on the site being able to get out onto the A449 and the fence itself will have an adverse impact as well as the stark urban appearance of the large open, hard surfaced area covered with Gypsy caravans and their accoutrements. There will also have to be an additional fence along the split level of the site (ix), again for safety reasons but also highly visible. There is an existing palisade fence around the salt yard but this will have to be doubled in length along the higher part of the site.
6. Topography – The site is not level and its elevated position in the landscape will result in the transit site being visually prominent (xii) & (xvi). In addition, the split nature of the site makes it impractical for use.
7. Privacy – The site is very open to views from passing vehicles (xvi) and due to the topography it will be difficult to give the Gypsies and Travellers an acceptable level of privacy and from that perspective would not encourage an extended stay (xv) but that is hardly a reason to allocate it.
8. Existing uses - The area is used for recreational purposes by walkers, nature lovers, joggers and cyclists. The introduction of a gypsy/traveller site will create an eyesore and potentially destroy an enjoyable green local area that will discourage the use of this area for leisure purposes. The area is also an area where there are plans to increase these leisure facilities by the development of a leisure/tourist facility on the opposite side of Bulmore Road for use by visitors to the area and local residents of Caerleon and Christchurch.
9. Proximity to local facilities – The site is socially unsustainable as a transit site due to it being isolated from local utilities, emergency vehicles, health services, schools and shops. It would be an isolated encampment, contrary to national advice (iii), (vii), (xi) & (xiii).
10. Unsuitable for children – The site is a dangerous location for children due to its proximity to the A449, a dangerous bend on a narrow lane and is unsuitable as a play area (iii) & (ix). The above representations refer to the fact that local schools have spare capacity at the moment (xi) but this site is in an isolated rural location from where access to local schools is difficult and potentially dangerous. Children from the site could not walk to school.
11. Possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment – The above representations state that the site has limitations for expansion by unauthorised encampments (ix) and would have minimal impact on local commercial and residential properties (x). However, the site is adjacent to the coach park formed for the Ryder Cup which is currently vacant and but its proximity to the proposed transit site means that it will be liable to be used as an unauthorised transit site or a tip.
12. Conflict with neighbouring uses – On the opposite side of Bulmore Road it is proposed to develop a leisure/tourist facility and the proposed transit site is also about 500 yards away from the proposed investment in new tourist Lodges. These investments were put on hold pending the decision on the A449 transit site and have only recently been commenced following the deletion of the

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

allocation of the A449 site (viii). The marketing plan for the Lodges is based on a rural, scenic location of outstanding natural beauty - not its proximity to a transit camp. It is also adjacent to the Wales Open and Ryder Cup course which holds major golf events every year and is a major tourist attraction to Newport which will be damaged by this proposal. There has been considerable investment into this area which is building upon the success of the Ryder Cup. Newport and the Celtic Manor Resort was placed on the world stage giving it exposure to new leisure markets and the new focus for the business is attracting families and leisure guests, as well as golfers, to the resort and to Newport. This strategy has seen the hotels reach full capacity on many nights since the Ryder Cup achieve an overall occupancy level that bucks the national trend. There have also been benefits to the local tourist and leisure economy as a result of the attraction of the Celtic Manor Resort with hotels, restaurants, shops and local attractions getting the benefit of associated spend. Siting a Gypsy transit site in this location will undermine this investment, the future use of the area as a leisure facility and damage Newport's burgeoning business tourist and leisure market. As a result of considerable investment and successes, the CMR is now a major employer in the area of about 1000 people and currently invests about £19 million per year into the local economy. It is the centrepiece of Newport's tourist and conference market and to damage that could be catastrophic. According to the national guidance, if a Gypsy were considering submitting an application for an encampment on this (or any) site, they would have to address a number of issues in their submission, not least of which the compatibility of the site with neighbouring uses and it is submitted that on such an assessment alone this site would fail.

13. Noise – There is considerable potential for noise and other disturbance from the A449 to the potential residents of the transit site. The site is virtually on the slip road onto a dual carriageway and is hardly an appropriate location to live, even for a short time.

14. Sustainability- All Gypsy and Traveller sites considered as options for a site allocation in a LDP must have their social, environmental and economic impacts assessed in accordance with the requirements of sustainability appraisal. The above reasons relating to economic, social and environmental reasons demonstrate that this is an entirely unsustainable and unsuitable site and must be rejected from consideration. None of the representations are accompanied by a sustainability appraisal.

In view of the fact that many of the representations have included a request to appear before the Inspector, it is requested that CMR be also afforded the same privilege to present its concerns to the Inspector.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | No | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | Yes | | | | | | | |

3039.K2 Cabrera, Mr Jose

15/10/2013

E

O

M

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at A449

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | |
|-----|----------------|
| 3 3 | Representation |
|-----|----------------|

In respect to the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013, I strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3042.K1 | Anderton, Mr Paul | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation proposal

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | |
|-----|--|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 |
|-----|--|

| | |
|-----|--|
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name A449 Former Depot |
|-----|--|

| | |
|-----|----------------|
| 3 3 | Representation |
|-----|----------------|

This site was proposed for inclusion in the draft LDP as a transit site for travellers but was rejected by the Council and the traffic proposals for the site are not supported by the Welsh Government. It is surprising therefore that the applicants (whoever they are) have put it forward again. I do not know who the applicant is but it is rumoured it is the residents or Councillors of another Ward in an attempt to resist a transit site in their own ward. That is not a sound reason for a transit site at this location. The site is adjacent to open countryside, has poor or dangerous access and egress from the A449, would require traffic to pass over unsuitable small country roads by alternative routes and the traffic arrangements for the site does not have the support of the Welsh Government. This is a cynical attempt to put the site back in the LDP when it has already been rejected.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K5 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Not a sustainable location for the proposed use

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | |
|-----|----------------|
| 3 3 | Representation |
|-----|----------------|

RAS(N)008 Abernant Depot Langstone
No access onto the A449 Trunk Road. Minimum visibility splay for the access is not achievable. The highway lanes in the vicinity of the site are too narrow to accommodate the anticipated volume and size of vehicle. The site is located in Parking Zone 6. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3673.K3 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Comment regarding constraints

| <i>Item Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|----------------------|--|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 |
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name A449 Former Depot |
| 3 3 | Representation Immature broadleaf woodland, located between to ancient woodland SINCS |
| 4 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3678.K2 | Price, Mr Sam | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Suggest Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| <i>Item Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|----------------------|--|
| 3 3 | Representation My name is Sam Price your local Gypsy. My opinion is you have helped out the local Gypsies who live at Brickyard Lane. Now you need to help the other Gypsies that come and go in the area and need some where to stay somewhere like - SITE REF - RAS(N)008 SITE NAME - A449 FORMER DEPOT TRANSIT ACCOMMODATION |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K11 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Comment regarding site characteristics and constraints (presence of dormice)

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
A449 Former Depot

3 3 Representation
Our records indicate that dormice, a European protected species, are present in close proximity to the site^

To meet ToS C2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 3692.K3 | Lawrence, Tracey | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | I | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Supports the proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name A449, Former Depot |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

The information in the register is incorrect. The A449 was within the first LDP draft and a sustainability appraisal carried out. NCC state the site would have to be expanded affecting the surrounding natural area including implications on dormouse. However NCC cannot confirm figures of how many travellers would be in Newport at one time. Figures are guessed on a bi annual registers and therefore the exact size of the G&T transit site cannot be determined at this time and therefore this site cannot be discounted. The site is off a main dual carriageway and whilst the WG letter states issues with traffic flow they do invite NCC to discuss further. This site is on the main flight path of G&T and would not affect nearby residential and commercial business. It is also a preferred site by the G&T community.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | Yes |
|---|---|---|-----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3699.K1 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name A449, Former Depot |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

This site was proposed for inclusion in the draft LDP as a transit site for travellers but was rejected by the Council and the traffic proposals for the site are not supported by the Welsh Government. It is surprising therefore that the applicants (whoever they are) have put it forward again. I do not know who the applicant is but it is rumoured it is the residents or Councillors of another Ward in an attempt to resist a transit site in their own ward. That is not a sound reason for a transit site at this location. The site is adjacent to open countryside, has poor or dangerous access and egress from the A449, would require traffic to pass over unsuitable small country roads by alternative routes and the traffic arrangements for the site does not have the support of the Welsh Government. This is a cynical attempt to put the site back in the LDP when it has already been rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K7 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Support for proposed allocation of land as transit G&T site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
A449 former depot

3 3 Representation
I support the inclusion of the above site as a suitable transit site.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why
All parts

As a resident directly affected I have valid concerns & questions to raise.

3738.K1 John, Major (Retd) W M

15/10/2013 P O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Object t the alternative site suggested off the A449.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off A449

3 3 Representation
The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and I strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3779.K1 | Horleston, Mr Peter G | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
A449

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted
The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3785.K1 | Dinham, Mr Mike | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |
|---------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection of proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
A449 Former Depot

3 3 Representation
I believe Lagstone area is unsuitable for proposed Gypsy sites. This is more suited to brown field development areas.

4 4 Additional Material Yes

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3795.K1 | Horleston, Bronwen A | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
A449 Former Depot

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted

The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3814.K1 | Saunders, Peter & Teresa | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Object to the suggested G&T site off the A449

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
A449, Former Depot

3 3 Representation

As the Welsh Assembly has objected to the use of the A499 access roads for this site, and as the only alternative access is through unsuitable single carriageway lanes, we strongly disagree with its inclusion. It is also too small to accommodate the seven gypsy and traveller pitches needed. We therefore urge the LDP accepted by the City Centre in June 2013 is accepted.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3848.K1 | Lockyer, Mr D A | | | 07/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Objection against Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation proposal

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name A449 Former Depot | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Although the proposed location is away from Langstone the road is a cross roads of several. My concern here is that the site is of limited size for such traveling communities but with easy access could easily result in overspill into the roads and surrounding countryside. Is there any guarantee that this would be a contained development and would not creep? Based on the location and limited size of this location this would have to be a big doubt and is of concern. Further what impact would this have in the future an services In nearby villages? If made permanent this would create another village in itself one not under the same rules as everyone else. Based on the site in Cardiff located close to Tremorfa and the rubbish generated in and around it this would mean more services being provided by the council to clean it up. Which community would pay for this? I do feel this is being pushed out to areas which could be used or placed back to their original condition. More brown field sites of which many are dotted around Newport should be considered. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3888.K1 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: A449 Former Depot Site is a more suitable G&T site

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name A449 Former Depot | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems. RAS(N)008 Former Depot RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner RAS(N)009 Former Speedway RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common RAS(N)051 Goldcliff | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3889.K1 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Support the suggested site at G&T at A449 Former Depot.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
A449 Former Depot

3 3 Representation

I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K2 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|---------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Support the A449 site as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Alternative sites I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot:- Not so far away that they would not knock on our doors plying their trade, but far enough to avoid gangs attacking them.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3891.K1 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Support use of former dept at A449 as a Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead.

RAS(N)008 Fomer Depot

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3892.K1 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Site at A449, Former Depot site would make a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Former Depot

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

- RAS(N)008 Former Depot
- RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
- RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
- RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
- RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
- RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
- RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
- RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
- RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
- RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K2 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Supports inclusion of site as allocation for G&T transit site.

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name A449 Former Depot | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation As a transit site. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed as attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3992.K2 | Sullivan, Mrs J | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Propose that the site at the Former Depot is a preferable Gypsy and Traveller site to that at Hartridge Farm Road

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Depot | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have look at proposed sites for Gypsy Camp and feel that these three sites will have the least impact on surrounding residential areas. They are easily accessible and amenities are not far away. I fell that the Hartridge site is too close to an already troubled area, which is trying hard to improve. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3994.K1 | Watkins, Sharne | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Object to the suggested site at A449.

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | |
|-----|--|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)008 |
|-----|--|

| | |
|-----|--|
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name A449 Former Depot |
|-----|--|

| | |
|-----|--|
| 3 3 | Representation A449 - objections have already been made clear in previous communications from residents of Langstone and surrounding areas. |
|-----|--|

RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted

The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|-----|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4124.K2 | Lawrence, Shirley | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Support proposed allocation of A449 as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | |
|-----|---|
| 3 3 | Representation The information in the register is incorrect. The A449 was within the first LDP draft and a sustainability appraisal carried out. NCC state the site would have to be expanded affecting the surrounding natural area including implications on dormouse. However NCC cannot confirm figures of how many travellers would be in Newport at one time. Figures are guessed on a bi annual registers and therefore the exact size of the G&T transit site cannot be determined at this time and therefore this site cannot be discounted. The site is off a main dual carriageway and whilst the WG letter states issues with traffic flow they do invite NCC to discuss further. This site is on the main flight path of G&T and would not affect nearby residential and commercial business. It is also a preferred site by the G&T community. |
|-----|---|

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|-----|---|----|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4127.K1 | Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher & | | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 481/ A449, Former Depot

Summary: Agree with the LDP that the A449 former depot site should not be used as a G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
A449 Former Depot

3 3 Representation

The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

Site,RepnType: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K3 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|--------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: No problems are envisaged with the public sewerage system as a result of proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site. No problems are envisaged with the public sewerage system for domestic foul discharge or at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic flows from the proposed site.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1395.K2 | Atwell, Cllr David | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)010 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land off Langstone Rise | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Would like to speak on all site from attached list that are included in LDP should comment be ignored. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1396.K2 | Atwell, Mrs Carole | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)010 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land off Langstone Rise | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3039.K3 | Cabrera, Mr Jose | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Additional material submitted

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land off Langstone Rise

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brown-field strategy. Therefore, in respect to the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 I strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3042.K4 | Anderton, Mr Paul | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)010

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Rise

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K5 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Comment on site characteristics/constraints

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)010

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Rise

3 3 Representation

Open woodland, no designation, limited ecological connectivity. PROW on boundary

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3779.K2 | Horleston, Mr Peter G | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)010

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Rise

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise.

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Sites Proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3795.K2 | Horleston, Bronwen A | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)010

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Rise

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3814.K2 | Saunders, Peter & Teresa | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Object to the suggested land off Langstone Rise.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)010

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Rise.

3 3 Representation

We are extremely concerned about the erosion of the attractive countryside on the fringes of the city, particularly as sufficient brownfield sites are available for housing. This site is outside the current settlement boundary, and remote from the limited facilities available in Langstone. Therefore, we strongly disagree with its inclusion in the new site proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3994.K3 | Watkins, Sharne | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)010

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Rise

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4127.K2 | Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher & | | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 482/ Land off Langstone Rise

Summary: Land off Langstone Rise should not be included in the Plan.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)010

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Rise

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Site,RepnType: 483/ Land South of Parc Seymour,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 51.K1 | Penhow Community Council | | | 10/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 483/ Land South of Parc Seymour

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)011 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land South of Parc Seymour | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation This is a Greenfield Site, Countryside and Special Landscape Area | |
| | | 1. We do not consider the proposed development to be appropriate within an area designated as Countryside and a Special Landscape Area; we feel that this proposal would have significant adverse effects on the rural landscape character of the area. The development would not be to the benefit of the rural economy. As a matter of general principle, we feel that planning applications should NOT be granted on greenfield sites whilst there are brownfield sites within the Newport area that have not been developed. Greenfields are always the cheapest / easiest options for developers and if planners do not stand firm on this principle, the hardest & most expensive sites will be left to become eyesores that will ultimately need to be cleared using public money. | |
| | | 2. The sites outside the current village envelope and as such would represent an extension into open countryside which would create a precedent for further developments and pressures on services. | |
| | | 3. This development is not consistent with Newport East's expansion proposals. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2208.K3 | Brook, Simon | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 483/ Land South of Parc Seymour

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land South of Parc Seymour

3 3 Representation

This is a completely inappropriate area for development in open countryside and bordered by a quarry on one side and a narrow lane on the other. There is no requirement for the further release of development land for building in the deposit plan. This alternative site should be rejected and the countryside and Special Landscape designations retained

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

3042.K5 Anderton, Mr Paul

02/10/2013 E O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 483/ Land South of Parc Seymour

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land South of Parc Seymour

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K12 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 483/ Land South of Parc Seymour

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)011 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land south of Parc Seymour |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Open Countryside (Greenfield) site* This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas as set out in the LDP, The proposal would result in piecemeal encroachment into the open countryside contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development. Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material Yes *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3699.K5 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 483/ Land South of Parc Seymour

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land South of Parc Seymour

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

Site,RepnType: 484/ Rock Farm,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1466.K1 | St Modwen Developments Ltd | Savills | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 484/ Rock Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)012

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rock Farm

3 3 Representation
Please see covering letter, dated 9th October 2013.

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside and most of them are allocated Special Landscape Area (SLAs). The development of those sites would be contrary to national and local policy as they are clearly in the wrong places (and none of them are need to meet housing need over the plan period or to extend range or choice of sites).

There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further.

For the avoidance of doubt the alternative site we are referring to are:

RAS(N)012 Rock Farm
RAS(N)014 Greenmeadow Farm
RAS(N)026 The Cayo, Llanvaches

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

Representations on Newport City Council's Alternative Sites Register (Revised Local Development Plan (RDLDP) Stage) Consultation
On behalf of St. Modwen Developments Limited

Savills is instructed, on behalf of St. Modwen Development Limited ('SMDL'), to make comments on the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

SMDL is committed to the ongoing redevelopment of the former Llanwern Steelworks through the Glan Llyn development and the adjacent employment site. This is one of Newport's (and south Wales') key regeneration projects and site on the major road and rail gateway into both the City and the Principality. Outline planning permission was granted in April 2010 for the whole scheme which will deliver 4,000 new homes and about a million square feet of new business space. A new neighbourhood will transform this previously developed site and will include substantial new areas of open space and parkland, a new rail halt, two new primary schools and a local centre. Development of the main new residential neighbourhoods will progress in three main sub areas, western, central and eastern and a masterplan for the western area, which contains the first 1,250 homes, was approved in November 2010. since then reserved matters for the first phase (of 300 homes) have been approved and development is underway. Alongside this work, SMDL is keen to push forward with the second phase of development with a reserved matters application for the next phase of infrastructure and landscaping works having been submitted to the Council in August 2013. all this demonstrates SMDL's continued commitment to the site and its future development.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLDP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations relates to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations. We were very pleased to see that the RDLDP's policies (stated objectives) place greater emphasis on the importance of Glan Llyn (compared with the previous version of the plan - the DLDP) and recognise the overall dividend the scheme will pay to Newport and south east Wales. This commitment should continue through the next stage of the plan and the Council's reaction to the allocations proposed by representors.

Glan Llyn is allocated under Policy H1(47) and the allocation corresponds to the outline planning permission granted for the redevelopment of the site.

The draft plans' strategic policies make it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction - a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Glan Llyn, remains a priority throughout the plan period. For this reason we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be leased only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The presentations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLDP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The sites allocated could deliver 12,000 new homes, which substantially more than is required and is a significant and unnecessary contingency. This is so much more than is required, that even if the greenfield sites were removed, both the 7,500 and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. This underscores the need to install a proper sequence to land release in points I - iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1 at all.

Alternative Sites

In this light with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule). Nor should any of the proposed "alternative" sites replace any of those allocated by the plan - all of them are within the countryside and most of them are allocate Special Landscape Areas (SLAs). The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. With sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements, there is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2208.K2 | Brook, Simon | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 484/ Rock Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)012

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rock Farm

3 3 Representation
This site is on an open area of land between the existing village boundary and the A48 main road. Development of this site would impact poorly on the aspect of Parc Seymour from the main road. As it is outside the village boundary it would set a precedent for further inappropriate development in open country around the village. There is no requirement for the release of further building land in the timescale of the plan. The proposed site for development should be rejected and the current plan designation as countryside and Special Landscape Area should be retained

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

2447.K1 Seymour, Anne

14/10/2013 P O M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 484/ Rock Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)012

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rock Farm

3 3 Representation
There is poor public transport to this site. There is no proposed broadband link. St Bride's Road is unsuitable as a link to Newport and rat running would worsen. The A48 floods at the Rock and Fountain from the Pike Road to Quarry (often). Entrance (badly) (cut off in above average rainfall) no work in area and no school. Area has few facilities but is a peaceful place despite A48 rush hour. Peace would be at risk with extensive housing development. Wildlife in quarry would suffer. One or two people would gain for large general loss.

4 4 Additional Material No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3042.K6 | Anderton, Mr Paul | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 484/ Rock Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)012

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rock Farm

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3574.K2 | Llanvaches Community Council | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 484/ Rock Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Rock Farm

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

The site is Greenfield in open countryside of great beauty and in a special landscape area. The land covered by the proposal is 8.9 hectares in extent: at the general rule-of-thumb rate of 30 dwellings per hectare, granting of the proposal could lead to 250-300 new dwellings being built. The site is not within nor connected to, any settlement boundaries. Hence, acceptance of the proposal could result in a completely new village, larger than Parc Seymour and 3 times the size of Llanvaches village.

Massive improvements to the road systems would have to be made to accommodate the additional 400+ cars that would be introduced.

The site is good agricultural land used for grazing cattle, sheep and horses and occasional arable crops.

The proposed development is against the decision made by Newport City Council in the Preferred Strategy 2008 document published in January 2008. This was reinforced in April 2012 stating "Given it's remote location and lack of public transport, Llanvaches is not the type of community where development should be encouraged." The Preferred Strategy stated that NCC will look to locate development on Brownfield sites"

The developer states that residents would enjoy a healthier lifestyle and improved mental health as they would be living in a rural environment. They have not considered that the mental health of existing residents would be compromised as their rural environment and lifestyle would be urbanised.

Mass urbanisation of the Langstone area has resulted in over subscription of available places in the schools that are in our catchment area. Schools situated in Caldicot and Chepstow are not within catchment and are governed by a different local authority.

There are no shops, medical facilities, post office, pharmacy or dentist within walking or easy cycling distance. The nearest supermarket is 8 miles away from the proposed development. Public transport is limited to 1 bus an hour and the nearest train station is 6.5 miles away.

The adjacent sewage system is already extremely overloaded.

The roads that the site would open onto are prone to flooding by fast flow surface water after heavy rain.

The quarry which is located next to the proposed development site is dormant not exhausted. There will be blasting at the site should it reopen.

4 4 Additional Material Yes

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3663.K6 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 484/ Rock Farm

Summary: Not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)012 Rock Farm Lanvaches

Most of the site is located outside of the 400metre walk distance to a bus stop. Site access will require extensive removal of hedging and trees. Footway between the site and the A48 will be required which may require third party land. The site is located in Parking Zone 6. Transport Assessment required. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K13 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 484/ Rock Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)012 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Rock Farm |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Open Countryside (Greenfield) Site* EPS – records of Dormice within/adjacent to the site^ This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas as set out in the LDP and would result in unacceptable encroachment into the open countryside contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development. Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material Yes *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. ^For sites with known potential for EPS: The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP. We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range. We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3699.K7 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 484/ Rock Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)012

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rock Farm

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

4128.K6 Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings

18/10/2013 E C M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 484/ Rock Farm

Summary: Historic built environment comments on Rock Farm

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)012

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Rock Farm

3 3 Representation

This site is in close proximity to three grade II listed buildings (3082 - Rock and Fountain Inn, 3083 - Rock and Fountain Barn and 2925 - old Turnpike Cottage) Development is likely to adversely affect the setting of these buildings, and any large scale development might also affect the wider rural setting of the grade II* listed Penhow Castle (3078).

Site,RepnType: 485/ Land off Magor Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1395.K3 | Atwell, Cllr David | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)013 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land off Magor Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)013 - Land off Magor Rd, Langstone I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Would like to speak on all sites from attached list that are included in LDP should comment be ignored. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1396.K3 | Atwell, Mrs Carole | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Magor Rd

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)013 - Land off Magor Rd, Langstone
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3039.K4 | Cabrera, Mr Jose | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Additional material submitted

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Land off Magor Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, in respect to the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013, I strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3042.K2 | Anderton, Mr Paul | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Magor Road

3 3 Representation

This site is outside the village boundary, is countryside, would require a change of use which is currently rural in nature; and there is already sufficient housing allocation provided in the draft LDP. The site also floods and there is inadequate drainage in Langstone.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K6 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Public Right of Way issues on proposed residential development at Magor Road, Langstone

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation
Brownfield and arable. PROW issues

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K14 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Comment regarding site characteristics and constraints

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Magor Road, Langstone

3 3 Representation

There may be hydrological continuity between the proposed alternative site and Langstone-Llanmartin Meadows SSSI which is located to the south. There is therefore the potential for development at this site to have an indirect adverse impact on the SSSI ~

The site is partially located within Zone C2, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the site to be partially within the 1% (1 in 100 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability fluvial flood outlines ++

To meet ToS C2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|---|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | Yes | |
| <p>~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.</p> <p>Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated. We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.</p> <p>++ For sites located within Zone C2: We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2." In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | No | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3699.K2 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Magor Road

3 3 Representation

This site is outside the village boundary, is countryside, would require a change of use which is currently rural in nature; and there is already sufficient housing allocation provided in the draft LDP. The site also floods and there is inadequate drainage in Langstone.

3738.K3 John, Major (Retd) W M

15/10/2013 P O M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Object to land of Magor Road, Langstone.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Magor Road, Langstone.

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site as it is outside of the curent settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and I strongly disagree to the inclusion of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3779.K3 | Horleston, Mr Peter G | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Magor Road

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)013 - Land off Magor Rd, Langstone
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3795.K3 | Horleston, Bronwen A | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Magor Road

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)013 - Land off Magor Rd, Langstone
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3814.K3 | Saunders, Peter & Teresa | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Object to the suggested alternative site at land off Magor Road

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)013 |
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name Land off Magor Road |
| 3 3 | Representation As this site represents another intrusion into the countryside and us outside the current settlement boundary we strongly disagree with its inclusion in the new site proposals. We accept the LDP proposed by the City Council in June 2013. |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3994.K4 | Watkins, Sharne | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)013 |
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name Land off Magor Road |
| 3 3 | Representation I confirm that this should not be included as as new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4127.K3 | Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher & | | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 485/ Land off Magor Road

Summary: Alternative site at Magor Road should not be included in the Plan.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Magor Road, Langstone.

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Site,RepnType: 486/ Greenmeadow Farm,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 51.K2 | Penhow Community Council | | | 10/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 486/ Greenmeadow Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)014 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Greenmeadow Farm |
| 3 | 3 | Representation This is a Greenfield, Countryside and Special Landscape Area 1. We do not consider the proposed development to be appropriate within an area designated as Countryside and a Special Landscape Area; we feel that this proposal would have significant adverse on the rural landscape character of the area. The development would not be to benefit of the rural economy. As a matter of general principle, we feel that planning applications should NOT be granted on greenfield sites whilst there are brownfield sites within the Newport area that have not been developed. Greenfields are always the cheapest / easiest options for developers and if planners do not stand firm on the principle, the hardest & most expensive sites will be left to become eyesores that will ultimately need to be cleared using public money. 2. We also have serious concerns about the water and drainage infrastructure. Homes in this area already suffer problems - if a significantly large number of new properties are to be added the whole infrastructure of the area would need to be redeveloped, not just "some improvement" made. 3. This is a very large projected development that , currently, has no suitable access roads. It is sited alongside Greenmeadow Lane, which is unsuitable for large vehicles. Before any development could commence, that access would require significant alternation - or a new access from the A48 would need to be provided. In either case, it would be necessary to have a new access onto the A48 that would be in close proximity to the access to Parc Seymour. 4. This large development will result a significant increase in traffic on the A48 and the Coldra roundabout. The recent improvement to the Coldra have made a significant improvement, but the A48 junctions are not traffic light controlled. Those of us who use those junctions regularly can see that it would not take a very big increase in traffic to unbalance the flow and leave us, once again, with long queues to access the roundabout at peak times. 5. The sites are outside the current village envelope and as such would represent an extension into open countryside which would create a precedent for further developments and pressure on services. 6. There is no justification for these developments in terms of the plans projected housing needs over the plan period. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1466.K2 | St Modwen Developments Ltd | Savills | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 486/ Greenmeadow Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)014

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Greenmeadow Farm

3 3 Representation
Please see covering letter, dated 9th October 2013.

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside and most of them are allocated Special Landscape Area (SLAs). The development of those sites would be contrary to national and local policy as they are clearly in the wrong places (and none of them are need to meet housing need over the plan period or to extend range or choice of sites).

There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further.

For the avoidance of doubt the alternative site we are referring to are:

RAS(N)012 Rock Farm
RAS(N)014 Greenmeadow Farm
RAS(N)026 The Cayo, Llanvaches

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

Representations on Newport City Council's Alternative Sites Register (Revised Local Development Plan (RDLDP) Stage) Consultation
On behalf of St. Modwen Developments Limited

Savills is instructed, on behalf of St. Modwen Development Limited ('SMDL'), to make comments on the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

SMDL is committed to the ongoing redevelopment of the former Llanwern Steelworks through the Glan Llyn development and the adjacent employment site. This is one of Newport's (and south Wales') key regeneration projects and site on the major road and rail gateway into both the City and the Principality. Outline planning permission was granted in April 2010 for the whole scheme which will deliver 4,000 new homes and about a million square feet of new business space. A new neighbourhood will transform this previously developed site and will include substantial new areas of open space and parkland, a new rail halt, two new primary schools and a local centre. Development of the main new residential neighbourhoods will progress in three main sub areas, western, central and eastern and a masterplan for the western area, which contains the first 1,250 homes, was approved in November 2010. since then reserved matters for the first phase (of 300 homes) have been approved and development is underway. Alongside this work, SMDL is keen to push forward with the second phase of development with a reserved matters application for the next phase of infrastructure and landscaping works having been submitted to the Council in August 2013. all this demonstrates SMDL's continued commitment to the site and its future development.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLDP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations relates to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations. We were very pleased to see that the RDLDP's policies (stated objectives) place greater emphasis on the importance of Glan Llyn (compared with the previous version of the plan - the DLDP) and recognise the overall dividend the scheme will pay to Newport and south east Wales. This commitment should continue through the next stage of the plan and the Council's reaction to the allocations proposed by representors.

Glan Llyn is allocated under Policy H1(47) and the allocation corresponds to the outline planning permission granted for the redevelopment of the site.

The draft plans' strategic policies make it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction - a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Glan Llyn, remains a priority throughout the plan period. For this reason we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be leased only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The presentations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLDP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The sites allocated could deliver 12,000 new homes, which substantially more than is required and is a significant and unnecessary contingency. This is so much more than is required, that even if the greenfield sites were removed, both the 7,500 and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. This underscores the need to install a proper sequence to land release in points I - iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1 at all.

Alternative Sites

In this light with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule). Nor should any of the proposed "alternative" sites replace any of those allocated by the plan - all of them are within the countryside and most of them are allocate Special Landscape Areas (SLAs). The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. With sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements, there is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2208.K1 | Brook, Simon | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 486/ Greenmeadow Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)014

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Greenmeadow Farm

3 3 Representation

The Revised deposit LDP has already identified sufficient development land to meet the housing requirement in the period of the plan. There is no need to release further land for development. This site would be a major extension to the existing village boundaries and would change the rural character of the area on land between the existing settlement and Wentwood. The high quality of the landscape is recognised in the deposit LDP as a Special Landscape Area. This is an area of countryside enjoyed by many people who live outside the immediate area - the designation should remain and the proposal to develop the site rejected. The fields encompassing the site are of relatively high agricultural value. Were this site to be developed it would be difficult to restrict further development in the area, in open country outside the village boundary and within the designated Special Landscape Area.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

3042.K7 Anderton, Mr Paul

02/10/2013 E O

M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 486/ Greenmeadow Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)014

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Greenmeadow Farm

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3663.K7 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 486/ Greenmeadow Farm

Summary: Not a sustainable location for the proposed use

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)014 Greenmeadow Farm Parc Seymour

The lane adjacent to the site is narrow and not capable of accommodating two way traffic flow or the anticipated traffic generated by any development. Any site access will requires extensive loss of hedging and trees. No footway between the site and the A48. The site is also outside of the maximum 400 metre walk to a bus stop. Most of the site is locating within Parking Zone 6.Transport Assessment required. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K15 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 486/ Greenmeadow Farm

Summary: Objection of proposed allocation of land for residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)014

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Greenmeadow Farm, Parc Seymour

3 3 Representation
Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Open Countryside (Greenfield)Site*
EPS – records of Dormice within/adjacent to the site^
This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas as set out in the LDP, and would lead to increased urbanisation of this semi rural area.

Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material Yes

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2.
This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.
If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:
The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3699.K6 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 486/ Greenmeadow Farm

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)014

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Greenmeadow Farm

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

Site,RepnType: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1395.K4 | Atwell, Cllr David | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: Objection to proposed development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)015 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Coldra Roundabout | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)013 - Land at Coldra Roundabout I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Would like to speak on all sites from attached list that are included in LDP should comment be ignored. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1396.K4 | Atwell, Mrs Carole | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)015

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Coldra Roundabout

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)013 - Land at Coldra Roundabout
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3039.K5 | Cabrera, Mr Jose | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Additional material submitted

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: Objection to proposed development at Land at Coldra Roundabout

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, in respect to the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013, I strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3663.K8 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: No objection if satisfactory access to Priory Drive is achievable

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)015 Land at the Coldra Langstone

No direct access to the A449 Trunk Road, The Coldra Roundabout (both Welsh Government roads) or Chepstow Road is acceptable. No objection if satisfactory access to Priory Drive is achievable (possible third party land required).

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K16 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)015

2 2 Alternative Site Name
North East Coldra

3 3 Representation

Proposed mixed development use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside (Greenfield) site*

The proposal would result in piecemeal encroachment into the open countryside contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development.*

EPS – records of Dormice within/adjacent to the site^

Contrary to ToS P2, C2, CE1, CE2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material

Yes

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2.

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3738.K4 | John, Major (Retd) W M | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: Object to the suggested alternative on land at Coldra.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)015

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Coldra Roundabout.

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site as it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and I strongly disagree to the inclusion of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3779.K4 | Horleston, Mr Peter G | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)015

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Coldra Roundabout

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3795.K4 | Horleston, Bronwen A | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: Objection to proposed development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)015 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Coldra Roundabout |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)013 - Land at Coldra Roundabout I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. |
|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3994.K5 | Watkins, Sharne | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: Objection to proposed development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)015 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Coldra Roundabout |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | Representation I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. |
|---|---|---|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4127.K4 | Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher & | | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 487/ Land at Coldra Roundabout

Summary: Land at Coldra Roundabout should not be included in the Plan.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)015

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Coldra Roundabout.

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this should not be included as as new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Site,RepnType: 488/ The Cayo,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1466.K3 | St Modwen Developments Ltd | Savills | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name
The Cayo, Llanvaches

3 3 Representation
Please see covering letter, dated 9th October 2013.

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside and most of them are allocated Special Landscape Area (SLAs). The development of those sites would be contrary to national and local policy as they are clearly in the wrong places (and none of them are need to meet housing need over the plan period or to extend range or choice of sites).

There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further.

For the avoidance of doubt the alternative site we are referring to are:

RAS(N)012 Rock Farm
RAS(N)014 Greenmeadow Farm
RAS(N)026 The Cayo, Llanvaches

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

Representations on Newport City Council's Alternative Sites Register (Revised Local Development Plan (RDLDP) Stage) Consultation
On behalf of St. Modwen Developments Limited

Savills is instructed, on behalf of St. Modwen Development Limited ('SMDL'), to make comments on the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

SMDL is committed to the ongoing redevelopment of the former Llanwern Steelworks through the Glan Llyn development and the adjacent employment site. This is one of Newport's (and south Wales') key regeneration projects and site on the major road and rail gateway into both the City and the Principality. Outline planning permission was granted in April 2010 for the whole scheme which will deliver 4,000 new homes and about a million square feet of new business space. A new neighbourhood will transform this previously developed site and will include substantial new areas of open space and parkland, a new rail halt, two new primary schools and a local centre. Development of the main new residential neighbourhoods will progress in three main sub areas, western, central and eastern and a masterplan for the western area, which contains the first 1,250 homes, was approved in November 2010. since then reserved matters for the first phase (of 300 homes) have been approved and development is underway. Alongside this work, SMDL is keen to push forward with the second phase of development with a reserved matters application for the next phase of infrastructure and landscaping works having been submitted to the Council in August 2013. all this demonstrates SMDL's continued commitment to the site and its future development.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLDP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations relates to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations. We were very pleased to see that the RDLDP's policies (stated objectives) place greater emphasis on the importance of Glan Llyn (compared with the previous version of the plan - the DLDP) and recognise the overall dividend the scheme will pay to Newport and south east Wales. This commitment should continue through the next stage of the plan and the Council's reaction to the allocations proposed by representors.

Glan Llyn is allocated under Policy H1(47) and the allocation corresponds to the outline planning permission granted for the redevelopment of the site.

The draft plans' strategic policies make it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction - a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Glan Llyn, remains a priority throughout the plan period. For this reason we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be leased only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The presentations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLDP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The sites allocated could deliver 12,000 new homes, which substantially more than is required and is a significant and unnecessary contingency. This is so much more than is required, that even if the greenfield sites were removed, both the 7,500 and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. This underscores the need to install a proper sequence to land release in points I - iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1 at all.

Alternative Sites

In this light with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule). Nor should any of the proposed "alternative" sites replace any of those allocated by the plan - all of them are within the countryside and most of them are allocate Special Landscape Areas (SLAs). The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. With sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements, there is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1653.K1 | Wood, Mr John | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name
The Cayo

3 3 Representation

Llanvaches is a close knit community of similar minded people who have worked hard to achieve an environment that we want to live in and on the way have, and continue, to contribute large amounts to enable society to function. We would have been called middle England (Wales).

The inhabitants are, without exception, proud of their village, proud to live in a working agricultural area with all of the surrounding countryside actively farmed, either with livestock or crops. It is therefore surprising that the owners say that the land in question, has not been farmed (not strictly true) because of its position and is not suitable for cultivation. It might be that it is more valuable, to the owners, for building. A non-reversible act and where, we understand building land is not in short supply.

The potential developers wish to build outside the village boundary, which is tight to the village boundary which is bordered on all sides by countryside with narrow roads and passing points, that require tolerance.

Llanvaches is in an area of little or no employment and commuting is a major occupation. It can be a hard place to live particularly for children and those without transport and cannot cope with its sense of isolation misbehaviour can be an outlet.

The villagers can obviously be classed as NIMBYS trying to protect the uniqueness of Llanvaches but on the other side of the coin we have landowners who want to extract maximum wealth from the land but with our view decisions can always be changed at a later date should a mistake have been made. Land the potential developers inherited but was farmed continuously by their forefathers and has been let for farming since.

Wales is a country of low population density and a reasonable abundance of land available for new homes with the infrastructure already available. Closer to all services and activities those homes will have an appeal to a wider section of the community.

Those homes will also allow for a planned replacement of "passed their best" accommodation.

Llanvaches is at the furthest point from Newport. Public transport is almost non-existent, a trip to the local doctor is via Chepstow or Langstone with a twenty minute walk to start with. Because Llanvaches is a small closely knit village neighbours fill the gap and act as something of a taxi service.

Llanvaches is one of a reducing number of small villages that are unique to Wales, cheap to service, low in crime and high in its ability to maintain itself.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3416.K1 | Roden, Mr David | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Object to the suggested site at The Cayo

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number |
| | | RAS(N)026 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name |
| | | The Cayo |
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
| | | <p>As a resident of eleven years in Llanvaches Newport, I wish to bring to your attention some of my observations regarding the above site. I live directly opposite The Cayo and have been impressed for the last ten years of how the farmer renting The Cayo had worked and maintained the field opposite. Imagine my disbelief and disgust when I read the untruths in the document proposing to convert the field to residential on the grounds that the field was not being farmed and unviable. Every summer, the field would be cut for hay and cattle would be placed on the field until November. Then sheep would be brought in and lambing would begin in the February before the field is left again for hay and the cycle continue. Last year, the grass was cut for hay as usual but no cattle were placed in the field because of the owner wanting to change its use. In a time of world food shortage and food inflation, this is shameful! This August, the cows have been brought back to the field proving that the field is viable. The suggestion to build a craft shop on this site of outstanding natural beauty is also outrageous. The Rock & Fountain Pub has changed management four times in two years despite total refurbishment by the owner, as it is not a viable business. Johnson's Store one mile from the village has been a grocery store with local produce, a flower shop, and a bookshop and is now up to let. Wentwood Inn on the A48 has been a pub, Thai restaurant, and Mexican restaurant and now sits derelict on the A48 two miles away and the farmer is suggesting a craft shop on such a stunning piece of Welsh countryside. As a community, we have supported Parc Seymour shop, which is run on a voluntary business, a few hours each day, and any profits reinvested in the shop to keep it open. Local people do not go to shops, they shop online and have their groceries delivered. Who is going to go to a craft shop in the middle of a field when they do not support their own visiting post office and library, which have now been taken away, and shops only a mile away? 'Sustainable and in keeping'? I do not think so!! When we moved to Llanvaches, we spent the first year campaigning for a school mini bus for the secondary school as, we as parents, were fed up of taking our children to the nearest bus stop down the narrow lanes and being caught in traffic jams every morning. We secured the bus and now as many as 12 students just for Caerleon Comprehensive use the bus, never mind the primary school buses to Langstone and Chepstow. These efforts have helped to ease traffic on the lanes and it is obviously more environmentally friendly than 50 different cars just taking their children to school by car. Every month, there is a serious road traffic accident turning right onto the A48 at the Rock & Fountain Pub. Despite road calming measures by the Highway Agency and talks with the police, accidents continue when exiting Llanvaches. To add more housing on either of the sites under proposal is not sustainable and environmentally friendly, it is simply placing more cars on the road in an area that cannot cope and experiences road traffic accidents on a regular basis. Unfortunately, public transport is not a viable alternative and the Grass Routes bus is only available for the elderly who cannot drive anymore, and is available only on request. More cars mean more traffic, more road maintenance, more jams and more accidents. Never mind the impact it has on the environment. Lastly, I would like to bring to your attention the horrendous flooding we experienced before Christmas last year and into the New Year. Llanvaches was literally cut off as every viable lane was under three feet of water and the A48 was closed. The new restaurant, Giovanni's, lost valuable business and residents like ourselves had a difficult journey to work because of the new building of New House, on Rectory Road and the so-called social houses – four houses of three storeys and a mansion that were given planning permission eight years ago. The natural stream that was filled in on the Cayo years ago re-emerged as a river flowing onto the A48 causing the road to be closed and drivers having to abandon their vehicles. And the owner believes this field makes prime real estate? I think not! I also notice that he wishes to build the houses off Rectory Road and not near him. NIMBY springs to mind! We are fully supportive of the redevelopment of brown sites in Newport. There are a lot of struggling businesses in the area. Please invest in them, and help and support them before destroying something we can never get back in the future.</p> |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3442.K1 | Ciccione, Lorenza | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Object to the suggested site at The Cayo

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name
The Cayo

3 3 Representation

As a resident of eleven years in Llanvaches Newport, I wish to bring to your attention some of my observations regarding the above site.

I live directly opposite The Cayo and have been impressed for the last ten years of how the farmer renting The Cayo had worked and maintained the field opposite. Imagine my disbelief and disgust when I read the untruths in the document proposing to convert the field to residential on the grounds that the field was not being farmed and unviable.

Every summer, the field would be cut for hay and cattle would be placed on the field until November. Then sheep would be brought in and lambing would begin in the February before the field is left again for hay and the cycle continue.

Last year, the grass was cut for hay as usual but no cattle were placed in the field because of the owner wanting to change its use. In a time of world food shortage and food inflation, this is shameful! This August, the cows have been brought back to the field proving that the field is viable.

The suggestion to build a craft shop on this site of outstanding natural beauty is also outrageous. The Rock & Fountain Pub has changed management four times in two years despite total refurbishment by the owner, as it is not a viable business. Johnson's Store one mile from the village has been a grocery store with local produce, a flower shop, and a bookshop and is now up to let. Wentwood Inn on the A48 has been a pub, Thai restaurant, and Mexican restaurant and now sits derelict on the A48 two miles away and the farmer is suggesting a craft shop on such a stunning piece of Welsh countryside. As a community, we have supported Parc Seymour shop, which is run on a voluntary business, a few hours each day, and any profits reinvested in the shop to keep it open. Local people do not go to shops, they shop online and have their groceries delivered. Who is going to go to a craft shop in the middle of a field when they do not support their own visiting post office and library, which have now been taken away, and shops only a mile away? 'Sustainable and in keeping'? I do not think so!!

When we moved to Llanvaches, we spent the first year campaigning for a school mini bus for the secondary school as, we as parents, were fed up of taking our children to the nearest bus stop down the narrow lanes and being caught in traffic jams every morning. We secured the bus and now as many as 12 students just for Caerleon Comprehensive use the bus, never mind the primary school buses to Langstone and Chepstow. These efforts have helped to ease traffic on the lanes and it is obviously more environmentally friendly than 50 different cars just taking their children to school by car.

Every month, there is a serious road traffic accident turning right onto the A48 at the Rock & Fountain Pub. Despite road calming measures by the Highway Agency and talks with the police, accidents continue when exiting Llanvaches. To add more housing on either of the sites under proposal is not sustainable and environmentally friendly, it is simply placing more cars on the road in an area that cannot cope and experiences road traffic accidents on a regular basis.

Unfortunately, public transport is not a viable alternative and the Grass Routes bus is only available for the elderly who cannot drive anymore, and is available only on request. More cars mean more traffic, more road maintenance, more jams and more accidents. Never mind the impact it has on the environment.

Lastly, I would like to bring to your attention the horrendous flooding we experienced before Christmas last year and into the New Year. Llanvaches was literally cut off as every viable lane was under three feet of water and the A48 was closed. The new restaurant, Giovanni's, lost valuable business and residents like ourselves had a difficult journey to work because of the new building of New House, on Rectory Road and the so-called social houses – four houses of three storeys and a mansion that were given planning permission eight years ago. The natural stream that was filled in on the Cayo years ago re-emerged as a river flowing onto the A48 causing the road to be closed and drivers having to abandon their vehicles. And the owner believes this field makes prime real estate? I think not! I also notice that he wishes to build the houses off Rectory Road and not near him. NIMBY springs to mind!

We are fully supportive of the redevelopment of brown sites in Newport. There are a lot of struggling businesses in the area. Please invest in them, and help and support them before destroying something we can never get back in the future.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3494.K1 | Celaschi, Mr John B | | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Objects to the Alternative Site at The Cayo

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)026 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name The Cayo, Llanvaches. |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I would like to object to the proposed development on good pasture at Cayo, Llanvaches. A. Use of Land I purchased my house when it was newly built in 1966. It is one of three houses which were built on the site of a derelict stone barn and which overlook the proposed site. In the period 1966 to 2000. The field was used in winter and spring as the nursery field for a flock of approx 1000 pregnant sheep and in jan/feb each year we would have 1000 to 2000 lambs with their mothers in the field until the lambs were separated in July/August. The field was then used to produce a crop of hay before sheep returned. In winter months the field would occasionally flood if we had a very wet season. It would flood at the top of the field as excess water passed under rectory road and would extend down the field on the line of an old drainage ditch which the farmer had filled, to facilitate ploughing and movement of stock. The water which passes under the road is excess water run off from the fields up as far as wentwood reservoir which flow down the stream at the side of the fields. If the fields flooded when sheep where in the field they would move to higher ground until the flood cleared. Farmer Keane, because of his age, gave up farming in the early 2000's and rented the whole of his farm. The tenant did not have sheep but ploughed all of the farm and grew cereals and rape. In the first season the tenant planted wheat and had difficulties when the season became very wet and the water built up down the field. The tenant then returned the field to pasture. Although the present tenant had difficulties with his cereals I understand that the field was used to grow cabbages during the 1939/45 war. At the time of writing this letter (14 Oct 2013) there are twenty/thirty cattle grazing in the area of the proposed development. B SERVICES Sewage: The existing sewage system is up to capacity and a new development will certainly need a major investment. Telephones: The telephone Broadband is also very slow due to volume of traffic compared to capacity of the lines. Roads: The roads into Llanvaches are narrow and additional traffic will obviously result in problems particularly when there is need for emergency services such as ambulances and fire engines. There is the problem for pedestrians and cyslists that if the hedges are not trimmed back the usable roadway narrows however the solution of this problem is more regular maintenance of the hedges. C: Additional Housing for Newport With the continuing rise in the cost of transport it does not seem prudent to extend development of Newport into remote areas when there are so many brownfield sites available close to the town centre and all the shops and amenities. |

B SERVICES

Sewage:

The existing sewage system is up to capacity and a new development will certainly need a major investment.

Telephones:

The telephone Broadband is also very slow due to volume of traffic compared to capacity of the lines.

Roads:

The roads into Llanvaches are narrow and additional traffic will obviously result in problems particularly when there is need for emergency services such as ambulances and fire engines. There is the problem for pedestrians and cyslists that if the hedges are not trimmed back the usable roadway narrows however the solution of this problem is more regular maintenance of the hedges.

C: Additional Housing for Newport

With the continuing rise in the cost of transport it does not seem prudent to extend development of Newport into remote areas when there are so many brownfield sites available close to the town centre and all the shops and amenities.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3574.K1 | Llanvaches Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at The Cayo

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

The following points are an outline of our concerns. A more detailed response is contained in the attached table. The table also highlights several important factual errors in the Developer's application.

The consultants (Malcolm Scott) are proposing construction of 18 dwellings on agricultural land in an area of great natural beauty --- and outside the village boundary.

Given its location and lack of public transport, Llanvaches is not the type of village where development should be encouraged. The Preferred Strategy stated that NCC will look to locate development on brownfield sites.

The proposed development is on a Greenfield site that floods frequently -- the result of surface water drainage from roads and high ground, plus overflow from Wentwood reservoir -- the water flow into the site follows an historic watercourse. In addition, the site is in the direct path of water should there be a failure of the reservoir dam or the need to dump water quickly to avoid damage to the dam wall.

There is no provision of an additional road to enter and exit the development, this would increase traffic flow in our narrow country lanes. The lanes are already prone to congestion and do not have sufficient passing places.

The sewage infrastructure within the village is totally inadequate to support more housing. The sewers are at capacity and currently overflow onto the site of the proposed development.

Mass urbanisation of the Langstone area has resulted in over subscription of available places in the schools that are in our catchment area. Schools situated in Caldicot and Chepstow are not within catchment and are governed by a different local authority.

There are no shops, medical facilities, post office, chemist or dentist within walking or easy cycling distance. The nearest supermarket is 8 miles away from the proposed development. Public transport is limited to 1 bus an hour during the working day and the nearest train station is 6.5 miles away.

4 4 Additional Material

Yes

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3663.K9 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)026 The Cayo Llanvaches

Transport Assessment required to determine the effect on the local highway network. No footway/cycle link to the nearest bus route on the A48. The site is located over 1.4 km from the nearest bus stop. The site is located in Parking Zone 6. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K17 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)026 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name The Cayo, Llanvaches |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Open Countryside (Greenfield)Site* EPS – records of Dormice within/adjacent to the site^ This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas as set out in the LDP. Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2. This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. ^For sites with known potential for EPS: The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP. We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range. We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3699.K8 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name
The Cayo

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4088.K1 | Qiaquinto, Mr & Mrs A | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at The Cayo

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We moved to Llanvaches from Lincolnshire in February 2013. We were in part motivated by information on Newport.gov.uk which stated that, "Given its remote location and lack of public transport, Llanvaches is not the type of village where development should be encouraged. The preferred strategy states that the Council will look to locate development on brown field sites in sustainable locations. Infill development has taken place in recent years and has provided no extra facilities, or positive character to the village. It has simply acted to place extra burden on the already fairly poor road network."

We strongly object to the proposed development on the grounds that:-

1.1. The road network is barely adequate and traffic cannot move freely along the roads. The single track roads providing access and exit to and from the village already lead to serious congestion at certain times of the day and some seriously frayed tempers to put it mildly.

2.2. The land on which the development would take place is agricultural land and currently used for haymaking, grazing sheep and cattle at different times of the year, providing quite a beautiful rural scene to the village and a picturesque landscape just off the A48.

3.3. Even as newcomers, we believe that such a beautiful open space should be conserved and its use not changed. It is a valuable asset not only to Llanvaches but also to Newport City Council.

4. Rectory Road, where the site access is proposed, is frequently used by groups of horse riders, cyclists and walkers who comment negatively on the volume of traffic on the Wye Valley roads by comparison. The entrance to the site would be opposite where pedestrians cross from the playing field and which already has a warning signpost.

5. There are absolutely no facilities in the village to support any further development.

6. There is alarming footage on the internet of flooding in the past on Millbrook Lane. Residents inform us that in past winters, after heavy rainfall, Longmeadow has been partially flooded for weeks and that the Rectory next door has been flooded together with our garden which already carries a culvert to divert water under Rectory Road and on to the site in question.

In short we consider the proposed development inappropriate in a green belt, in conflict with the needs of the village and visually damaging to a landscape that enhances Gwent.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4107.K1 | Yates, A | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 488/ The Cayo

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at The Cayo

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

With reference to the above Planning Application, I wish to object to the proposals on the following grounds

- 1 The land has been in use for Agricultural Purposes for the last 30 years since I have lived here and has been used for the grazing of cattle, sheep and the provision of hay without any apparent effect and is not contaminated.
 - 2 The area is outside the natural boundary of the village and should not be considered for housing where there are large brownfield sites available within the Newport City area.
 - 3 Road access to the A48 is not good and there have been a number of problems recently concerning Tabernacle Road of which the City Highway Department are aware.
 - 4 The area is prone to flooding and is not suitable for housing.
-

Site,RepnType: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1395.K5 | Atwell, Cllr David | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)042 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Longleat, Chepstow Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)042 - Longleat, Chepstow Road I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Would like to speak on all sites from attached list that are included in LDP should comment be ignored. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1396.K5 | Atwell, Mrs Carole | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)042 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Longleat, Chepstow Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)042 - Longleat, Chepstow Road I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3039.K6 | Cabrera, Mr Jose | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|---------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Longleat, Chepstow Road

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore in respect to the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013, I strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3042.K9 | Anderton, Mr Paul | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)042

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Longleat, Chepstow Road

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K10 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)042 Longleat Chepstow Road Langstone

The site is located in Zone 6 of the Parking Standards but is located within 400 metres of a bus stop. However is on the extremity of Langstone and is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K18 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)042 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Longleat, Chepstow Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside (Greenfield) site* The proposal would result in piecemeal encroachment into the open countryside contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development.* Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3699.K9 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)042

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Longleat, Chepstow Road

3 3 Representation

With regard to the remaining sites proposed in part A for Langstone for housing development, I object generally to any green field site development without very exceptional reasons in support because there is sufficient housing provision in Newport already in the LDP.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3738.K5 | John, Major (Retd) W M | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Object to the suggested site at Longleat, Chepstow Road

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)042

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Longleat, Chepstow Road

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site as it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and would be a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and I strongly disagree to the inclusion of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3779.K5 | Horleston, Mr Peter G | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)042

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Longleat, Chepstow Road

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)042 - Longleat, Chepstow Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3795.K5 | Horleston, Bronwen A | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)042

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Longleat, Chepstow Road

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)042 - Longleat, Chepstow Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3814.K4 | Saunders, Peter & Teresa | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Object to the alternative site suggested at Longleat, Chepstow Road.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)042

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Longleat, Chepstow Road

3 3 Representation

As this site represents another intrusion into the countryside and is outside the current settlement boundary we strongly disagree with its inclusion in the new site proposals. We accept the LDP proposed by the City Council in June 2013.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3994.K6 | Watkins, Sharne | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)042

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Longleat, Chepstow Road

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4127.K5 | Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher & | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 489/ Longleat, Chepstow Road

Summary: Longleat, Chepstow Road should not be included in the Plan.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)042

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Longleat, Chepstow Road

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Centre in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Site,RepnType: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1395.K6 | Atwell, Cllr David | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Objection to proposed development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|---|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)043 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land off Langstone Court Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Would like to speak on all sites from attached list that are included in LDP should comment be ignored. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1396.K6 | Atwell, Mrs Carole | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)043

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Court Road

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3039.K7 | Cabrera, Mr Jose | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Additional material submitted

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Objection to proposed development at Land off Langstone Court Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore in respect to the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013, I strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K11 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Site is lower in level than Langstone Court Road and will require extensive fill to provide.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)043 Land off Langstone Court Road Langstone

Direct access onto the A48 Chepstow is not acceptable. Any access from Langstone Court Road must be located away from the A48 junction and opposite Court Meadow junction. The site is lower in level than Langstone Court Road and will require extensive fill to provide.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3683.K19 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Additional material submitted

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Potential concerns regarding proposed allocation of land for leisure use/development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)043

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land off Langstone Court Road

3 3 Representation

Proposed Leisure use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside (Greenfield) Site*

The proposal has the potential to result in piecemeal encroachment into the open countryside contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development. More details of the type and scale of leisure use proposed is required to enable us to comment more fully.*

Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material

Yes

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3738.K6 | John, Major (Retd) W M | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Object to land off Langstone Court Road Alternative Site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)043

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Court Road.

3 3 Representation

I confirm that the site not be included as a new site as it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and I strongly disagree to the inclusion of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3779.K6 | Horleston, Mr Peter G | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)043

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Court Rd

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3795.K6 | Horleston, Bronwen A | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)043

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Court Rd

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3994.K7 | Watkins, Sharne | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)043

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Court Road

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Rd.
I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal fo this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4127.K6 | Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher & | | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Land off Langstone Court Rd should not be included in the Plan.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)043

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Langstone Court Road

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4128.K5 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|--|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 490/ Land off Langstone Court Road

Summary: Historic Environment comments on Land off Langstone Court Road.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)043

2 2 Alternative Site Name
RAS(N)043

3 3 Representation

This site is adjacent to a scheduled ancient monument (MM058 - Langstone Fish Pond). However, the proposed use might not have an impact.

Site,RepnType: 491/ Oak Court,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 321.K5 | Newbridge Ests & John Fmly | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)049 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and
- CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)049 seeks the allocation of land at Oak Court, Langstone. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.

The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (RAS(N)030) is a highly suitable alternative it:

- „h Immediately adjoins the settlement of Rhiwderin;
- „h Is in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport and is a sustainable location;
- „h readily links into the existing highways network;
- „h has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1117.K6 | Herbert, Richard | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land as a residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)049 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and
- CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)049 seeks the allocation of land at Oak Court, Langstone. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.

The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Llwynhaid, Bettws (RASN031) is a highly suitable alternative it:

- Sits immediately adjoining the settlement boundary;
- The site is visually and physically well contained;
- is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services;
- is well served by public transport;
- has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1395.K7 | Atwell, Cllr David | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)049 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Oak Court |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)049 - Oak Court (Gorelands proposals) I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Would like to speak on all sites from the attached list that are included in LDP should comment be ignored. Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1396.K7 | Atwell, Mrs Carole | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)049 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Oak Court | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)049 - Oak Court (Gorelands proposals) I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1418.K5 | Pontymister Dev Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential-led mixed-use development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)049 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Oak Court |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)049 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)049 seeks the allocation of land at Oak Court, Langstone. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Risca Road, Rogerstone (RAS(N)025) is a highly suitable alternative it: <input type="checkbox"/> Sits immediately adjoining the settlement boundary and would be integrated with the existing pattern of built development; <input type="checkbox"/> is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services; <input type="checkbox"/> is well served by public transport; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1666.K5 | Murray, Mrs H E | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed residential-led mixed-use development at Oak Court

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)049 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Oak Court |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)049 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)049 seeks the allocation of land at Oak Court, Langstone. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at The Griffin, Bassaleg (RAS(N)024) is a highly suitable alternative it: <input type="checkbox"/> would be integrated with the existing pattern of built development; <input type="checkbox"/> provide a mixed use scheme comprising of residential and leisure/educational development; <input type="checkbox"/> is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2072.K5 | Newbridge Estates Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential-led mixed-use development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)049 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and
- CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)049 seeks the allocation of land at Oak Court, Langstone. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.

The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (RAS(N)030) is a highly suitable alternative it:

- Immediately adjoins the settlement of Rhiwderin;
- Is in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport and is a sustainable location;
- readily links into the existing highways network;
- has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3039.K1 | Cabrera, Mr Jose | | | 11/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Oak Court

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

In response to your email below concerning the latest Newport area LDP issues I would reiterate my respective objections as are detailed in the five attached letters in respect to Langstone previously emailed to your corresponding email address including Ms Lindsay Christian of NCC. Attachments detail opposition to: Oak Court and Ford Farm developments, Gypsy site and safeguarding natural resources.

Trusting NCC will give due consideration to the interest of Langstone and surrounding communities who have to burden NCC's final decision whether good or bad as may be the case.

I would kindly refer you to my objections in respect to developing the above Alternative Sites as detailed in the attached correspondence dated 01 and 03 February 2012 and would be most grateful should you give my comments further consideration.

You may recall our telephone conversation on the 27 January 2012 when you kindly explained the current situation in respect to the prospective residential development of 'green-field land for Oak Court, which following further investigation on my part may also include the 'green-field site at Ford Farm. I would also take this opportunity in sincerely thanking you for your time in discussing matters in light of my unannounced telephone call which may have imposed upon other more pressing business engagements planned in your agenda. If you recall I mentioned I would write to Newport City Council Planning Department airing my concerns which are shared by the inhabitants of the village of Langstone, for which I would comment as follows. In doing so please accept my sincere apologies should the content in places concede to emotive script given the subject matter is close to the hearts of most of the villagers residing in Langstone and I would suspect the inhabitants of Newport, who wish to protect the countryside and surrounding villages.

Firstly I would explain that I bought the above property on 27 May 2011 despite the fact I live and work in Amsterdam at the moment, with the view of returning to Newport towards the end of this year. I chose the property on the premise it overlooked the rolling green countryside (to the front and rear) and living in Langstone seemed appealing at the time, which I understand also relates to the views of other villagers who share similar surroundings. However, to my utter dismay (and that of Villagers) a parish meeting was convened in Langstone on Sunday 22 January 2012 attended by approximately 300 villagers which addressed issues concerning the prospective Oak Court residential development comprising in excess of 200 dwellings, a doctor's surgery and a convenience store etc., which would occupy the agricultural land running alongside the A48 immediately in front of my property and the properties of many other villagers. Unfortunately I did not attend the meeting given I was not informed and neither was Miss Steffi Bergmann residing in my property. I imagine far more people living in the village would have attended (myself included) had the meeting been announced correctly. You will appreciate having searched for a property for almost 2 years prior to purchasing Braeside involved protracted research as relative to flooding, subsidence, mines, appeal, local amenities and potential developments in surrounding areas etc., and it came as a complete shock to be informed of the prospective residential development for Oak Court and potentially Ford Farm (both green-field sites), in light of the fact prior to purchase, Newport City Council Planning Department informed me no sites or indeed the highway had been earmarked for development! improvement in front of or to the rear of my property. it also transpires, commencing August! September 2011 the respective stretch of road running alongside the entire length of the proposed Oak Court development underwent substantial alteration as relative to providing a wide pavement over the applicable length of highway, which I have been informed barely receives any pedestrian traffic, as concurred by one of the Council's Planning Officers prior to my call to your good-self on 27 January 2012. This would therefore appear to be at odds with the fact no development was planned at the time for Oak Court. Needless to say, had I known about these prospective residential development(s) I would most certainly not have purchased a property in Langstone, which may be reflected in other peoples views should the development(s) go ahead.

You will also appreciate that local planning and matters relating to the environment are very complicated and diverse subjects, and unlike your good-self, the majority of people have little knowledge or expertise as relative to the 'whole picture' concerning Newport and surrounding areas. However, in an attempt to express my concerns and those of fellow villagers, I have reviewed elements of Newport City Council's planning policy and I must say it would appear well balanced and a most interesting read, encompassing the requirements of both the city and its surroundings as well as addressing the interests of the inhabitants in the area. I would go as far as to say, should nothing good come of this letter in regard to declining respective housing schemes in Langstone, at least I have pride in supporting Newport City Council's commitment and endeavours to conserve the countryside and provide a good location for people to live in and enjoy. As such, I would be most grateful should you give consideration to the following points in respect to the concerns shared by the villagers of Langstone as relative to the prospective housing schemes, with anticipation that Newport City Council will decline approval to allow the development of both (and other similar) sites in Langstone and corresponding inclusion in the forthcoming Local Development Plan. I understand the above developments are officially named potential Candidate Sites as follows:

- 132.C1:

- 1343.C1:

- 1400.C1:

- 1400.C2:

Sustainability

Oak Court Langstone.

ditto.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

knowledge development costs in respect to green-field sites are in most cases reduced, given little if any ground preparatory work is required, where there is also no requirement to demolish existing structures and foundations, as would predominantly be the case when developing brown-field sites. Hence the increased interest in developing greenfield sites as opposed to the regeneration of brown-field areas. I am also convinced developers do not entirely consider the needs of respective Villages or their inhabitants on an individual basis or indeed understand the concept of village life. As relative to the prospective residential scheme for Oak Court in Langstone, I understand the developer may be Sir Robert McAlpine who as a national house builder will no doubt see fit to incorporate standard 'off the shelf housing designs' to blot the landscape in numbers, which will not contribute to the aesthetics of the village and possibly serves to encourage its demise. I for one would be encouraged to sell my property to avoid the protracted noise during construction, erosion of the countryside and the undesirable prospect of increased traffic spilling onto the A48 and associated increase in unpleasant noise and pollution. Unfortunately other Villagers may be encouraged to leave Langstone too, which may have undesirable consequences in so far as reducing the selling prices of existing properties and fragmenting Village community spirit. In this respect would there be entitlement to financial compensation for Villagers seeking to leave Langstone as a consequence of the intrusive developments.

3

Employment in the Village

- With all due respect to the developer(s), very few jobs will be created in the village as a result of either or both housing schemes. Furthermore, the construction business by its very nature (and in most cases) offers transient employment through more often than not a mobile workforce and not necessarily from the county of Gwent or city of Newport. As was the case with the recent construction of the new Severn Power Combined Cycle Gas Turbine Power Station in Nash, Yes, the respective workforce contributes to the local economy however, when works are complete most if not all vacate the area entirely, contributing little to the permanent stability of the area or businesses as would be the case in point for Langstone.

- I understand the developer's intention is to provide a surgery and a convenience store. However in reality none of these are required, given there are sufficient surgeries to accommodate the village in the immediate surroundings and a more than adequate convenience store provided by the local garage whose trade may be adversely affected as a consequent of the provision of a further and unnecessary store which would seem unfair having made concerted efforts to provide the community with a most friendly and appreciated service. In addition, most villagers do their weekly shopping at the larger stores (e.g. Tesco and Morrisons etc.) where there is a larger choice with products at cheaper prices.

Traffic

- Given very little employment will be created in the village of Langstone resulting from respective housing schemes including the proposed development at nearby Catsash, most of the newcomers to the village will seek to work outside of the Village. I understand the Oak Court and Catsash schemes alone comprise 200 and 50 new dwellings respectively which based on an average family of 2,5 and taking into consideration public transport, may result in an additional 300 to 400 cars (more again should the Ford Farm go ahead) joining the A48 at peak times each day, namely early

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| | | <p>morning and in the evening, This would also serve to challenge Newport City Council's planning policy in respect to reducing travel by car in favour of walking, cycling or opting for public transport, Furthermore, the anticipated traffic would increase undesirable road noise and emissions to the detriment of the local environment and potentially contribute towards climate change, Moreover, surrounding highways including the A48 and M4 already suffer from heavy congestion at peak hours and would not benefit from the additional transit generated by Oak Court and Ford Farm developments,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further traffic calming may be required in Langstone involving traffic signs, speed ramps and possibly additional cameras all at unnecessary additional cost to be funded through taxes, • The recreational activities of the increased population of Langstone would also add further burden upon highways with private car usage which are already stretched to capacity during peak times given village activities may be considered as limited, <p>4</p> <p>especially by the younger generation, adding further noise and pollution to. the environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst walking into town from Langstone may be considered by many as an adventure/ feat in itself given the distance involved, cycling is not a safe option due to the lack of a dedicated cycle paths which not only applies to the length of highway running alongside the Oak Court development. In addition, traversing the M4 junction 24 roundabout poses a danger in itself. This comes from personal experience and would surely present a challenge to the unaware child or indeed adult and may even lead to accidents, some fatal. • The Coldra roundabout can hardly be considered suitable for the increased traffic which would particularly suffer at peak times and may require amplification to meet increased traffic at expense to Newport City Council and tax payers. • In low light conditions e.g. during the evening/ night, the number of cars exiting the prospective developments (especially that of Oak Court) may give rise to a situation where headlamps illuminate property frontages running along the A48 immediately in front of the developments, which may be considered intrusive and irritating by respective owners who are currently not exposed to such interferences. • The increase in number of students travelling to schools and colleges etc. would also place an additional demand on highways, especially families opting to take their children to school via private cars which appears to be the trend nowadays. <p>Infrastructure and facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water supplies, sewers, power, highways may all need to be upgraded to serve Oak Court and Ford Farm developments, the costs of which would most probably be apportioned amongst the Developer, Council and respective utility companies. In addition the developments may involve Newport City Council in unnecessary costs as relative to the potential expansion of the only local primary school in the village. In the main, said improvements and additional costs may only improve the quality of life to the respective few. Were the Developer to provide housing in the city's brown-fields sites, some of which are substantially larger in size and would significantly contribute to accommodating far more residents, respective improvements may benefit a far greater audience including existing city residents, especially concerning improvements in highways and the like. <p>Quality of Life</p> | | | | | | | | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I understand from villagers there is no need for the residential developments at Oak Court and Ford Farm as relative to village requirements. Villagers want to retain the countryside within the footprints of the prospective residential schemes whose development would only serve to detract from their feeling of well being and also their quality of life. Furthermore, there is no need to destroy the countryside which provides a setting for the village of Langstone and Newport. In contrast and in this instance, it would appear respective developers have absolute disregard for the countryside and the 5 pleasures gained by all in respect to its beauty, and instead glare at it with glazed eyes in contemplation of exploitation and financial gain. The potential scale of the additional schemes would also be considered as intrusive in matters concerning the village and its inhabitants. Indeed it is difficult to ascertain any need arising from housing schemes in the village of such scale which necessitate a requirement to destroy and develop on irreplaceable countryside.• In light of the fewer facilities on offer in Langstone and surrounding areas, and taking into consideration any proposed improvements resulting from respective developments, imposing additional housing upon the Village of Langstone in the numbers proposed is unlikely to increase the quality of life for existing inhabitants or indeed newcomers. On the contrary, the irritation of increased traffic accompanied by corresponding increases in road noise and pollution, coupled with the wilful destruction of irreplaceable countryside will only serve to drive away many of the existing population, possibly to be replaced by residents who have no regard to village life or indeed the countryside, which can already be seen in up and coming younger generations. Increased traffic also reduces the quality of life of Village inhabitants.• Whilst I am sure the Village of Langstone would embrace residential developments of moderate size and number (possibly referred to by some as piecemeal development) such as to provide homes to people who wish to return to Langstone, the developments at Catsash and Oak Court alone would increase the population by approximately 625 when indeed the current population is in the order of 3900 people, representing a considerable increase of 16%. This does not take account of any sizeable increase in population posed by the prospective development of Ford Farm etc. Essentially the developments are too large and inappropriate for the village. I am more than confident those wishing to return to live in Langstone would do so primarily to enjoy the aspects of village life with which they were previously accustomed and would not wish to be associated in having encouraged or participated in large developments such as Oak Court or Ford Farm including the erosion of countryside which provides a vital landscape setting to everybody. Respective residential developments of the size intended detract from the qualities expected of village life and also serve to undermine close knit communities for which Village life is associated, which will be completely changed with no guarantee for the better. I am also convinced that should Newport City Council sanction such housing developments, this would encourage similar schemes with undesirable consequences to Langstone as a small 'village' and Newport generally, both in the knowledge that few villages would be protected from unfavourable, unnecessary and insensitive expansion. The countryside should be conserved for future generations to enjoy and should not be considered an expendable commodity.• In reference to the geographical location of Langstone as relative to Newport city centre and other areas which may offer employment, said developments at Langstone are also | | | | | | | | | |

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

not conducive to supporting affordable housing for families and individuals with low incomes who may struggle to afford private transport and who cannot rely upon public transport in its current state or indeed afford corresponding fares. In addition, any proposed convenience store would provide basic consumables at higher prices than larger food chain stores closer to the centre of Newport city. This situation would appear to be in conflict with Newport City Council's planning policy as relative to new residential developments catering for affordable housing for which the circumstances detailed above would unfairly discriminate against families with low incomes who may find it costly and impractical as relative to mobility. With this in mind, it is most evident both residential schemes would benefit from being located closer to the centre of the city of Newport taking advantage of its existing facilities and infrastructure and encouraging the regeneration of brown-field sites with the prospect of greater opportunities in maintaining employment whilst complying with the ethos prescribed in Newport City Council's planning policy.

The inhabitants of Langstone (myself included) completely understand the pressures imposed upon Newport City Council by respective parties wishing to have plots of land incorporated into the impending revision of the Local Development Plan for impending construction, for which the efforts involved in defining respective policy including classification of land use alone would be considered by most as very complicated and very demanding, if not daunting task. However in such cases (unless prevailing circumstances dictate to the contrary leaving no alternative), the inhabitants of Langstone, and I am sure Newport and surrounding villages, would encourage Newport City Council to resist requests to develop green-field sites and the countryside in the interest of the entire community. Furthermore, it has been our experience that Newport City Council is firm, fair and most responsible when dealing with issues concerning planning and the environment, undertaking to provide for the community of Newport and its surroundings as a whole rather than concede to the desires of individual parties whose endeavours may solely be focused on financial gain. With this in mind, the inhabitants of Langstone have absolute confidence in Newport City Council declining respective planning approvals in relation to the prospective developments for Oak Court and Ford Farm in the village of Langstone, as has been the case in the past. We would also sincerely anticipate Newport City Council adheres to its planning ethos (endorsed by the inhabitants of Newport) encouraging the regeneration of brown-field sites as opposed to depleting green-field areas which would involve irreversible and detrimental impact upon the environment and countryside.

On a personal note, I sincerely thank you for taking time to read this letter and would apologise for its length. I also realise planning can at times be a controversial subject and that it may not be an easy task determining a favourable outcome to all concerned. I sincerely hope other villagers in Langstone express their concerns to Newport City Council formally and in writing etc. regarding the prospective developments for which no doubt you will give due consideration, given it would appear just in allowing the community to have a hand in forging development in its village, whom feel privileged to live in Langstone. However, I sadly fear this may not be the case given I understand previous attempts have already been made in the past to gain planning approval to construct on the land in question which were sensibly declined by Newport City Council for flying in the face of planning policy and maybe villagers feel too confident the same will happen again as relative to recent applications to develop the land who will only have themselves to blame should permission be granted. Furthermore, many villagers may not be in a position to communicate or express themselves for whatever reason e.g. old age etc., therefore true numbers opposing the developments may not be reflected in correspondence received by Newport City Council to-date.

On a separate note, would it be possible to explain events and corresponding timetables to the village in respect to awarding or declining planning approval for the developments at Oak Court and Ford Farm and should an unfortunate award be granted, corresponding timetables for construction, the type(s) of housing envisaged etc. and exact numbers including the cross section of people respective developments would cater for, such that we may further gauge impact upon the village and the timescale for corresponding action.

Following my letter dated 01 February 2012 concerning the above subject which was actually emailed to you on 31 January 2012 in respect to the potential residential developments of the following Candidate Sites:

- 132.C1:
 - 1343.C1:
 - 1400.C1:
 - 1400.C2:
- Oak Court Langstone.
ditto.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Ford Farm (Larger site), Langstone.

Ford Farm (Smaller site), Langstone.

I also wanted to mention that granting planning permission to develop the above countryside areas, which would also apply to other green-field sites in the Newport area, whether in urban, semi-urban or rural locations, may serve in setting a precedence to promote future schemes of the same kind detracting from the advantages of brown-field regeneration, given the former may be more attractive to the developer for reasons stated in my previous letter.

This would also undermine Newport City Council's planning policy and detract from established concepts of sustainability and conservation which despite the obvious, as relative to the depletion of attractive green-field areas including the countryside, may also lead to undesirable consequences in so far as (but not limited to) the degradation and decline of Newport city as a consequence of under development of large brown-field areas, leading to reduced prospects and furthermore bolstering unemployment to the detriment of the area and its inhabitants.

I would express my sincere thanks should you give these points your consideration.

Thank you most kindly for your email dated 13 June 2013 notifying me of the latest revisions to the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan (LDP 2011/2026) which highlights the new introduction of areas of land in and around Langstone designated as 'Sand and gravel resource'. The following comments would apply to all respective areas indicated in the attached map extracted from the LDP denoted by either red circles or a red rectangle, of which my property and many others are unfortunately located in the latter as engulfed by respective proposals.

Whilst any reasonable member of the public would understand the difficulties faced by all Local Authorities in designating land for particular use, in respect to the above subject matter the residents of Langstone sincerely share a common belief that recent modifications incorporated in the latest LDP in respect to designating land in Langstone and surrounding areas for sand and gravel extraction as inappropriate and not carefully thought through, merely addressing a potential requirement imposed by the Welsh Assembly to consider areas in respect to ultimately, sand and gravel extraction. I am sure all Local Authorities are capable of creating wish lists detailing desirable and valuable resources to be sourced locally (e.g. sand! gravel), however, is this practical or indeed necessary given such resources are extensively available on the marked from elsewhere. It may be worth noting from the attached extract taken from NCC's latest LDP that said land proposed for potential sand and gravel extraction is immediately adjacent to and surrounds residential areas and roads for which the following points give great cause for concern! alarm should respective proposals go ahead, which serve to diminish the qualities associated with living in a village community.

- 1) Excessive and prolonged noise and airborne dust pollution will not be sufficiently containable by any barrier or sprinkler systems.
- 2) The local road network would not cater for the additional heavy load traffic associated with commercial quarrying causing further congestion and maintenance costs (to the tax payer) including increased exposure to accidents.
- 3) House prices will most definitely reduce- and substantially, as a consequence simply designating respective areas for quarrying in the LDP, given undesirable proximity issues.
- 4) Health and safety would be a major concern especially in respect to inquisitive children residing in the village with a desire to enter the quarry as their 'play-ground', irrespective of any fence system installed.
- 5) Future land reinstatement opens avenues into potential land fill/ waste site facilities with undesirable consequence in respect to smell, vermin, traffic and the like.
- 6) The attraction of living in Langstone will diminish considerable. Indeed, I have decided that enough is enough and have been driven into putting my property onto the market for sale as of mid July 2013 following proposals in respect to; the Oak Court development immediately opposite my property, followed by a gypsy site to the rear of my property and the latest issue engulfing my property, which is addressed by this letter. For the record, NCC's original LDP designated respective areas of land as

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

countryside, as it should remain . The question begs, what other proposals are yet to be tabled by NCC and/or prospective developers in respect to Langstone and surrounding areas in the LDP. History would indicate further prolonged distress is to follow.

7) Evidently as defined by the attached plan, the proposed area allocated to potential sand and gravel extraction is in aggregate almost (if not) the same size (m²) as the village of Langstone itself. Is it anticipated by NCC that Langstone should now become a Village associated with heavy and extensive quarrying, despite the fact the Village is designated a residential area, the latter of which is the prime reason for residents locating to Langstone.

8) Can NCC condone land to the front and rear of properties as being designated for quarrying purposes without due consideration to occupiers of respective properties e.g. land within the circles and rectangle of the attached map. Furthermore, should proposal go ahead, village communications would be severed (e.g. Chepstow Road as would the nearby motorway).

Furthermore, has NCC determined via suitable investigations that respective areas are suitable for commercial quarrying in terms of volume , quality of product and location etc. and have corresponding studies been carried out.

In conclusion, Langstone residents are thoroughly disheartened and frustrated with NCC in respect to its revised LDP.

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional green-field housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore in respect to the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013, I strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | Yes | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | No | |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3042.K3 | Anderton, Mr Paul | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

This site is in open green field countryside. Brown field sites within Newport should be developed first. There is adequate housing provision in the draft LDP already. There are drainage issues in Langstone which has already been exacerbated by existing developments. There is inadequate sewerage in Langstone. The people of Langstone have by questionnaire voted by significant majority against development on this site. Details of the questionnaire are available from Langstone Community Council who commissioned the questionnaire.

I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K12 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: TA will be required to confirm the impact of the development

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)049 Oak Court Langstone

A transport Assessment will be required to confirm the effect of the development on the local highway network in term of capacity and safety. The existing vehicular access into the site is not suitable for the anticipated traffic generation. A roundabout is required to provide adequate access which will need to be offset from the existing carriageway due to its size and the need for deflection of approaching traffic on the A48. Additional bus stops or a diverted bus stop will be required to ensure that all properties within the development are within 400 metres of a bus stop. Most of the site located within Zone 6 of the Parking Standards although this is anticipated to be amended to Zone 4 should development take place.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K20 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for mixed-use development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)049 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Oak Court |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed mixed development in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside (Greenfield) site* The proposal would result in encroachment into the open countryside leading to increased coalescence of settlements along the A48, and contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development.* Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2. This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3699.K3 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

This site is in open green field countryside. Brown field sites within Newport should be developed first. There is adequate housing provision in the draft LDP already. There are drainage issues in Langstone which has already been exacerbated by existing developments. There is inadequate sewerage in Langstone. The people of Langstone have by questionnaire voted by significant majority against development on this site. Details of the questionnaire are available from Langstone Community Council who commissioned the questionnaire.

I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3738.K7 | John, Major (Retd) W M | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|---------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Object to alternative site suggested at Oak Court

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site as it is outside of the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional green-field housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and I strongly disagree to the inclusion of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3779.K7 | Horleston, Mr Peter G | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)049 - Oak Court (Gorelands proposals)

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3795.K7 | Horleston, Bronwen A | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)049 - Oak Court (Gorelands proposals)

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3814.K5 | Saunders, Peter & Teresa | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Object to the alternative site at Oak Court

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

As this site represents a major intrusion into the countryside and is outside the current settlement boundary we strongly disagree with its inclusion in the new site proposals, particularly as sufficient brownfield sites are available for housing. We accept the LDP proposed by the City Council in June 2013.

3818.K1 Griffiths, Mr John

25/09/2013 W M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Object to the proposed development at Oak Court

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

The extent and nature of this proposed development is unacceptable given the paucity of the existing facilities within the area. The infrastructure of the village, particularly as it relates to drainage, sewage and surface water removal is inadequate for a development of this size. The additional strain on the control of traffic is also unacceptable.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3994.K2 | Watkins, Sharne | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Object to the alternative site suggested at Oak Court.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court

3 3 Representation

Oak Court - there is adequate provision for housing (in fact it exceeds requirements) in the draft LDP already without developing additional greenfield sites. Potential for development here would radically change the landscape in Langstone and decimate one of the few desirable areas in the city.

RAS(A)003 - Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site)

I strongly support the proposed alternative use fro this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

4127.K7 Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher &

21/10/2013

P

C

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 491/ Oak Court

Summary: Land at Oak Court should not be included in the Plan.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)049

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Oak Court (Goreland proposals)

3 3 Representation

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3663.K13 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 493/ Barn Farm Land

Summary: Transport Assessment will be required to confirm the impact of the development

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)056 Barn Farm Llandeud

A transport Assessment will be required to confirm the effect of the development on the local highway network in term of capacity and safety. Llandeud does not benefit from public transport nor is the access lane suitable for buses. The lane has no footway/cycle provision to the A48 which is the nearest bus route. The site is located further than the maximum walk distance to a bus stop. It is not clear from the location plan if an existing access is to be used or new one provided. Details will be required to comment on access suitable before comment on acceptability may be given. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use. The site is located in Zone 6 of the Parking Guidelines

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K21 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 493/ Barn Farm Land

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)056 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Barn Farm Land, Llandevaud | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed new residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside (Greenfield) site* No need has been identified for this scale of development in this location. The proposal would result in significant encroachment into the open countryside and be contrary to the promotion of sustainable patterns of development.* Contrary to ToS P2, C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| | | *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Site,RepnType: 494/ Land adj Tennyson Avenue,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 357.K4 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 494/ Land adj Tennyson Avenue

Summary: No problems envisaged at the receiving WwTW as a result of proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Depending on the proposed density of the site, hydraulic modelling assessments may be required to assess the impact of the development on the local water and sewerage networks. No problems would be envisaged at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K14 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 494/ Land adj Tennyson Avenue

Summary: Not a suitable location for the proposed use

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)029 Land adjacent to Tennyson Avenue
A transport Assessment will be required to confirm the effect of the development on the local highway network in term of capacity and safety from the SDR to the site. Station Road is not suitable for vehicular access .Public transport is infrequent, there is currently only one service which is financially supported by the Council operating an approximate frequency of every 2 hours between Newport and Caldicot. There is no bus stop in the vicinity with the bus turning in Tennyson Avenue picking passengers up on the road. The site is located within Parking Zone 6 but the site if developed is anticipated to be Zone 5. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K12 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 494/ Land adj Tennyson Avenue

Summary: Comments on proposed development at Land adjacent Tennyson Avenue

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Semi-improved grassland. Good landscape connectivity. PROW link potentially within site boundary.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K23 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 494/ Land adj Tennyson Avenue

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for mixed-use development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)029

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent Tennyson Avenue

3 3 Representation

We consider the proposal represents encroachment into the open countryside, contrary to the general principles of sustainability and the overall strategy of the LDP.

The site is partially located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM)

referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines +

Contrary to ToS C2 and CE1, CE2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material Yes

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 495/ Glan Llyn,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 357.K5 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 495/ Glan Llyn

Summary: No problems are envisaged at the receiving WwTW as a result of proposed development

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site and our local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows. However, off-site watermains and sewers will be required which can be provided by requisition schemes, under the provisions of Sections 41-44 and 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. No problems are envisaged at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1420.K2 | Corus UK Ltd / Tata Steel UK Ltd | GVA Grimley | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 495/ Glan Llyn

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Glan Llyn

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We write in relation to the Alternative Sites Register (Revised Deposit Stage) published for consultation in September 2013. This submission follows previous representations made on behalf of our clients, Tata Steel, in relation to the emerging Local Development Plan (LDP). Our previous comments have been specifically concerned with the allocation of sites for future gypsy and traveller pitches. Having reviewed the Alternative Sites Register we would like to comment on two sites identified for potential new gypsy and traveller accommodation. The sites are the Former Speedway site (Ref: RAS(N)009) and Glan Llyn (Ref: RAS(N)036). The Alternative Site Schedule does not indicate whether the sites are put forward for transit or residential pitches (or both). We have set out the reasons for our clients objections to both sites below. We would also like to reiterate our support for the proposed deletion of the allocation for gypsy and traveller accommodation at Hartridge Farm Road under Policy H16. As previously stated in our representations to the Revised Deposit, the allocation of land at Hartridge Farm Road as a permanent residential site fails to meet the necessary tests of soundness and is unsound. Our reasons for objecting to Hartridge Farm Road were set out in detail in our response to the Revised Deposit Draft and have not been repeated here. The Former Speedway site was included in the original 'long list' of locations considered by the Scrutiny Committee for Community Planning and Development. The site was also included on a shortlist of eleven potential sites (for transit use only) that was consulted on in September/October 2012. An objection to the potential allocation of the site for gypsy and traveller provision was submitted as part of this consultation on behalf of our clients. Following the consultation process the site was rejected by the Scrutiny Committee and was subsequently not included in the Revised Deposit. We maintain the view that the Former Speedway site is not suitable for use as a gypsy and traveller transit site. The site does not accord with the guidance set out in the Welsh Government Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites in Wales (2009). The guidance notes that local authorities should avoid locating sites next to or near hazards which present specific risks to children and adults, such as industrial sites. Due to limited indoor space, it is recognised that the outdoor environment is particularly important to gypsy and traveller children. This adds to concerns regarding the suitability of locating a gypsy and traveller site next to existing industrial and commercial uses.

The Good Practice Guidance also notes that ultimately, if a location is considered inappropriate for residential use, then it should not be considered appropriate for a gypsy and traveller site. In the case of the Plover Close site, it would clearly not be suitable for residential use. A report to the Scrutiny Committee for Community Planning and Development in October 2012 recognised that "an application from a house-builder on this site would be rejected, unless part of a redevelopment of the wider industrial area." The report also recognises that "other sites were discounted from the shortlist for these same reasons." The Welsh Government Good Practice Guidance also notes that the same considerations that are applied to permanent residential sites should be applied to transit sites when considering site selection and location. The Council's own assessment suggests that the site is not suitable for a permanent residential site, which we would agree with. For the same reasons, however, we would also argue that the site is not a suitable location for a transit site. The location of the Former Speedway site would be inappropriate in terms of residential amenity, given concerns regarding noise and light pollution. During the site assessment process, the Scrutiny Committee also noted that access to services would be problematic given the need to cross a dual carriageway to access them. Aside from suitability, it is also questionable whether the site is available. The site is currently in active use and benefits from an extant planning permission for B1, B2 and B8 uses. The Scrutiny Committee report issued in October 2012 concluded that the Former Speedway site was less suitable than other preferred sites and it wasn't as accessible from the predominant transit routes used by gypsy and traveller families passing through Newport. Consideration was also given to concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposal on the delivery of Glan Llyn residential development and the importance of that project to Newport's regeneration and growth. As such, the Scrutiny Committee concluded that the site should not be included in the LDP. We support the conclusions of the Scrutiny Committee with regard to this site, and maintain that the site is not suitable for either residential or transit use. The potential of the Glan Llyn development to accommodate gypsy and traveller pitches was assessed as part of the 'long list' of potential sites considered by the Scrutiny Committee. The assessment noted that the site benefits from planning permission for a significant regeneration scheme, which is considered to be key to Newport's future growth. As such, the site was rejected and not included in future shortlists of potential sites.

As stated above, the developers responsible for Glan Llyn have previously raised concerns relating to impact of other proposed locations for gypsy and traveller sites on their development. These concerns were noted and taken into account by the Scrutiny Committee during the assessment process. Clearly the allocation of a gypsy and traveller site within the Glan Llyn development itself would have an even greater impact. Glan Llyn has been planned over a number of years with an agreed masterplan for its future development and initial phases now in place. Given the future development proposals the site is unlikely to be available or deliverable for the accommodation of gypsy and traveller sites. As such, the site should not be considered for the provision of gypsy and traveller pitches through the LDP.

In conclusion, we continue to support the deletion of Hartridge Farm Road as a proposed residential gypsy and traveller site. We also object to the proposed identification of the Former Speedway site and Glan Llyn for gypsy and traveller pitch provision. We would therefore ask the Council and Inspector to delete Hartridge Farm Road from the LDP and dismiss the proposed inclusion of the Former Speedway and Glan Llyn sites.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1466.K4 | St Modwen Developments Ltd | Savills | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 495/ Glan Llyn

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)036

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Glan Llyn

3 3 Representation
Please see covering letter, dated 9 September 2013.

We strongly object to the two sites (Glan Llyn and the Former Speedway) that have been forward by representors as gypsy and traveller sites as part of the Alternative Sites stage of the Revised Local Development Plan (RDLDP).

Glan Llyn is a hugely significant regeneration scheme and purposes the complete transformation of a major brownfield site. It has the support of all key stakeholders and planning permission based on a comprehensive and high quality masterplan which will deliver a substantial number of new homes together with many other social, economic and environmental benefits. As such, it is not possible or appropriate to allocate a site for gypsy and traveller uses.

The 'Former Speedway' site is unsuitable on planning grounds. The main reasons for this have fully considered and accepted by the Council. These are the site's location within an established and important industrial area which is at risk of flooding and which is next door to a strategic employment allocation. This site is also unsuitable due to its impact on Glan Llyn.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

Representations on Newport City Council's Alternative Sites Register (Revised Local Development Plan (RDLDP) Stage) Consultation
On behalf of St. Modwen Developments Limited

On behalf of St. Modwen Developments Limited (SMDL), Savills has submitted a number of representations (to all stages during the preparation of Newport's Local Development Plan (LDP) in relation to proposed gypsy and traveller sites. Having reviewed the Alternative Sites Register we wish to strongly object to two sites proposed by representors - the 'Former Speedway' and 'Glan Llyn' - as potential gypsy and traveller sites.

SMDL is the master developer of the Glan Llyn regeneration scheme and Persimmon Homes (Wales) Limited (PHWL) is in the process of building the first phase of new homes. The Glan Llyn concept aims to create a new high quality neighbourhood based on 4,000 new homes, significant open space, a local centre, new schools and new employment land (the Celtic Business Park) and other commercial, leisure and community uses). It will completely transform this previously developed site and the eastern gateway into the City and is one of Newport's (and South Wales') key regeneration projects. Outline planning permission for the scheme was granted in April 2010 which rests on a comprehensive masterplan that sees each of part of the site given a role and purpose. Significant progress has already been made against a backdrop of very difficult market conditions. The first phase is well underway and SMDL is keen to push forward with the second phase of development with a reserved matters application for the next phase of infrastructure and landscaping submitted to the Council in August 2013. All this demonstrates SMDL's continued commitment to the site and its future development.

In this context - with objectives and aspirations confirmed and agreed, masterplans prepared and with planning permissions in place - there is simply no scope for a different allocation on the Glan Llyn site. It is not promoted by St Modwen and is not deliverable or desirable.

With regard to the 'Former Speedway' site, representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (in May 2012) and the Revised Deposit LDP (RDLDP) (in July 2013) setting out our key concerns about this site (and some of the other allocations) and to ensure the decision made by the Council was soundly based on planning criteria.

The Council recognised these points and we were very pleased that the 'Former Speedway' allocation was not pursued in the RDLDP. However, for the same reasons it is important that the allocation is not resurrected now. On planning grounds the site is a clearly unsuitable place for any form of residential development (which is the key test when allocating sites for gypsy and travellers). The main reasons for this have been fully considered and accepted by the Council. These are the site's location within an established and important industrial area which is at risk of flooding and which is next door to a strategic employment allocation.

This means that the site cannot meet Welsh Government guidance and any application would fail because of:

- the noise and disturbance created by industrial processes and traffic - by existing users or by businesses that might set up there.
- the potential complaints from the site that could affect existing business users or adjacent land (or limit the uses or occupiers that could be attracted there)
- flood risk which is a recognised constraint.

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that was undertaken by Atkins as part of the LDP process reaffirms this view concluding that the 'Former Speedway' site should be discounted from further consideration because of its likely economic impact (on Glan Llyn), its location within Zone C1 floodplain, its lack of accessibility to Atkins' reference to the impact on Glan Llyn is important and is the second reason why the 'Former Speedway' site fails.

The Council is fully aware that it is very important that no projects are undertaken which affect or jeopardise the performance of Glan Llyn (including an alternative use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation). As stated above, the progress that has been made in difficult conditions is very encouraging, but those general conditions remain challenging. The last things the scheme needs is uncertainty or threat and this would be the consequence if ever the 'Former Speedway' site was resurrected as a potential gypsy and traveller site allocation.

The same is also true of course for an allocation on the Glan Llyn site.

For these reasons, we strongly object to the two sites referred to in this letter have been put forward as Alternative Sites by representors.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|---|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | Yes | | | | | | | |
| <p>Glan Llyn is the largest single housing site within the City. It is important that the developers are represented at the examination in order to ensure that we are involved in any discussion on potential gypsy and traveller sites.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3673.K17 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
| <p>Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 495/ Glan Llyn</p> <p>Summary: Comments on proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Glan Llyn</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Item Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 3 | Representation | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Former Steelworks SINC located on site. Brownfield habitat. Area has good potential for accessible natural Greenspace.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K24 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 495/ Glan Llyn

Summary: Proposed G&T site would be particularly vulnerable to flooding

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)036 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Glan Llyn | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15). The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability tidal flood outlines of the Severn Estuary+ (See additional information and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material +For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K11 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 495/ Glan Llyn

Summary: Support for allocation of land as a residential G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)036 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Glan Llyn | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support inclusion of this site. This is the ideal opportunity for Newport Council to design a residential site taking into account traveller & non traveller needs. As quoted by Mark Hand "no site is perfect" - this could end this problem as you could create the "perfect site". Moreover house buyers of Glan Llyn will be aware of a site before hand rather than as I did buy your perfect house only to have a traveller site of enormous size dumped in front of your property! | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts As a resident directly affected I have valid concerns & questions to raise. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K4 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 495/ Glan Llyn

Summary: Support for the allocation of this land as G&T residential site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)036 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Glan Llyn | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation An opportunity here to design a successful residential site and its immediate surrounding areas that will give choice for occupation for both travellers and the settled community alike. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4054.K1 | Morgan, Mr Malcolm | | | 09/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 495/ Glan Llyn

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation within site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)036

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Glan Llyn

3 3 Representation

We the residents of the area are fully opposed to a travellers site so close to schools houses and amenities. House/land value is crashing. A camp 193.67 hectares becomes the biggest in Europe. Not in our back yard! Newport is dying now this will close it completely. I will sell my properties and pull it.

We also feel this building has started without consultation.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why
The views of landowner, residents of Ringland

Yes

Site,RepnType: 496/ Goldcliff,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K12 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Dependent on the scale and location of the proposed site, water supply and sewerage facilities could be provided

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Dependent on the scale and location of proposed sites we would be able to provide water supply and sewerage facilities to the sites but this is likely to require the provision of off-site watermains and sewers, which can be requisitioned under Sections 41-44 and 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. An alternative means of sewerage disposal may be considered and we would recommend consultation with Natural Resources Wales. Once sites have been identified we will be able to provide further comments.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3673.K25 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Comments on proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Goldcliff

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

The large undefined area covers the Gwent Levels SSSI and also includes part of Newport Wetlands National Nature Reserve and the Gwent Wetland Reserve SINC. PROW issues also NCN routes. TPOs in area

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K52 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Comments regarding SSSI status, flood risk and apparent absence of sustainability appraisal

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)051

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Goldcliff

3 3 Representation

It does not seem that a Sustainability Appraisal has been supplied in support of this proposed allocation. Given the content of the Welsh Government's policy clarification letter CL-01-11 Local Development Plans - Sustainability appraisal procedure for alternative site representation, we therefore do not consider the proposed allocation complies with the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations.

Much of this area is notified as the Gwent Levels - Nash and Goldcliff SSSI. There is a potential for direct or indirect adverse impacts from development on the SSSI. Given the lack of detail provided by the proponent in relation to the location of the proposed alternative site, we are unable to provide further advice on any likely impact from any development in this area on the SSSI. We would remind you of your authority's duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reasons of which the site is of special interest #

TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15). A precise location plan has not been provided, however the area of Goldcliff is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the area is within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines +

(See additional information and hyperlink)

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | | Yes |
| <p># For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.</p> <p>We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.</p> <p>In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.</p> <p>+For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K1 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Support for allocation of land as G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)051 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Goldcliffe | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support inclusion of this site. Travellers have occupied this site for 40+ years. They are accepted by the local community and are happy. All they require are facilities - a very cost effective solution for Newport rate payers. Plus pleasing and travellers & non travellers. Why is the council forcing them to move? | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts. As a resident directly affected I have valid concerns to raise plus questions. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3888.K10 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Site at Goldcliff is a more suitable G&T site.

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)051 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Goldcliff | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems. RAS(N)008 Former Depot RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner RAS(N)009 Former Speedway RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common RAS(N)051 Goldcliff | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3889.K10 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Support the suggested Gypsy and Traveller site at Goldcliff

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)051 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Goldcliff |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives. RAS(N)008 Former Depot RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner RAS(N)009 Former Speedway RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common RAS(N)051 Goldcliff |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K11 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Support land at Goldcliff for Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Alternative site I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas.

Already site occupied by a well settled accepted G/T family it would family it would shameless to moce them after forty years.

Another happily settled family G/T group at reputedly the best, well kept site in Wales who if Tata agreed would be delighted to stay put plus the cost to the council would be nil. Why not make representation to Tat to lift the removal order.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3891.K10 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Support use of site at Goldcliff as Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead.

RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3892.K10 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Land at Goldcliff is a more suitable G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|---|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)051 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Goldcliff | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems. RAS(N)008 Former Depot RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner RAS(N)009 Former Speedway RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common RAS(N)051 Goldcliff | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3938.K3 | Newport Traveller Sites Study Group | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
| Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage | | Site: 496/ Goldcliff | | | | | | | | |
| Summary: Support Site - family should be allowed to stay there | | | | | | | | | | |

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation As a result of our study we would presume to suggest the following strategy. The traveller family at the long established Goldcliff site RAS(N)051 should be allowed to stay there. | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K14 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 496/ Goldcliff

Summary: Support for allocation of land as a residential G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)051 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Goldcliff |
| 3 | 3 | Representation A site very strongly favoured by the smallest of the traveller family who has occupied the site in excess of forty years and have been accepted by that local community and should not now be forced to move. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group |

Site,RepnType: 497/ Queensway Meadows,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K16 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: No problems are envisaged with the public sewerage system

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site. No problems are envisaged with the public sewerage system for domestic foul discharge or at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic flows from the proposed site.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3048.K1 | Celtic Recycling | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Queensway Meadows

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)001

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Queensway Meadows

3 3 Representation

I believe this site contradicts points C1, CE1 and CE2. Housing a G&T site next to the biggest industrial and commercial area in Newport would make no business sense whatsoever. We have several blue chip companies (incl. National Grid, EDF, Sneider to name a few) who would certainly not want to send electrical equipment worth millions of pounds to our facility when the stigma associated with G&Ts would cause concerns with the security of their equipment. There are several areas far more suited to these needed sites for the G&Ts without exposing local businesses to increased security and insurance costs. I have a petition formed last year available with over a hundred separate business signatures from the area if required to support our disapproval.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3076.K1 | Storage Giant | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Queensway Meadows

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)001 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Queensway Meadows | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation It is my view that the above named site at Queensway Meadows fails the C1 and C4 consistency test, because I cannot see that use of this land as a transit traveller site has taken into account the more relevant development and strategies in the Queensway Meadows area, or that it has taken account of community strategies. Also, I believe it fails CE2 coherence and effectiveness test, because NCC already have a number of more suitable transit sites to consider. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3219.K1 | Carlsberg UK Ltd | Gerald Eve | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Queensway Meadows

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

It is considered that the Report of Community Planning and Development Scrutiny Committee adequately details that the proposed allocation Gypsy and Traveller Sites in the Revised Deposit Plan has been founded on a comprehensive and credible evidence base; that the likely impacts arising from the creation of a 'Transit sites' have now been given adequate consideration. There is clear evidence to justify the allocation of land at Celtic Way, Coedkernew as a transit site; and a contingency site at Former Ringland Allotments for transit accommodation in the Revised Deposit Plan instead land at Queensway Meadows.

Any substitution of the Gypsy and Traveller Transit Sites identified by draft Policy H15 with Land at Queensway Meadows would result in a site that has been identified on a robust evidence base as being unsuitable for allocation replacing a site identified as suitable for allocation - which would make the policy 'unsound'.

Accordingly, Land at Queensway Meadows should not be considered as suitable for allocation under Policy H15.

(Please refer to letter from David Bodily dated 15 October 2013 for further detail.)

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

I write on behalf of Carlsberg UK Ltd (Carlsberg), who lease and operate the Nash Mead Depot (the 'Depot') on the Queensway Meadows Industrial Estate, to submit representations to the Revised Local Development Plan for the City of Newport - Alternative Sites Consultation.

Carlsberg previously submitted representations to the emerging Newport Local Development Plan at 'Deposit Plan' stage on 8 June 2102 objecting to the proposed allocation of the 'Queensway Meadows' site under draft Policy H15, on the basis that the proposed allocation was not founded on a comprehensive and credible evidence base; that the likely impacts arising from the creation of a 'Transit site' in this location had not been given adequate consideration and that there was insubstantial evidence to justify the allocation of the site in preference to other, potentially more suitable and sequentially preferable locations as the proforma used to assess each site were incomplete and contained very limited information. In the letter, concern was expressed that Queensway Meadows is located 'out of the way' from any existing residential community in a location which does not benefit from access to a number goods, services and uses required by residential communities and thus would serve to isolate 'gypsies and travellers' from the rest of the population, against the aims of Circular 30/2007 and Planning Policy Wales.

Concern was raised regarding the location of a site on land identified as being 'at risk of flooding' as defined by the Environment Agency, where Planning Policy Wales identifies 'vulnerable development' such as this should not normally be located. Furthermore, serious concerns were raised regarding noise and highway safety arising from siting a residential community in an allocated employment area with heavy industrial uses and HGV traffic. On the basis that such a location would be likely to be deemed unsuitable for residential use it was considered that the proposed allocation contravened Welsh Assembly Government Guidance which considers that 'if a site is not suitable for residential use it is not suitable for a Gypsy Traveller site.'

It was considered that more thorough and detailed assessment of potential sites needed to be prepared, with clear rationale provided for the selection of sites for 'Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation' in the Local Development Plan under a revised draft Policy H15.

Following the end of the consultation period for the Deposit Plan, in June 2012, Newport City Council's Scrutiny Committee was informed that the new administration had recognised that the process of identifying Gypsy and Traveller sites was inadequate and asked for a re-examination of the locations for Gypsy and Traveller Sites to be included in the Local Development Plan. The Scrutiny Committee for Community Planning and Development meeting then determined on 27 June 2012, to appoint a new Policy Review Group to undertake the research work over the summer and report back to the full Committee.

237 potential sites were considered by the Policy Review Group and following a thorough review process 11 sites were identified that best met the criteria identified in accordance with Welsh Government Circular 30/2007: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites in Wales, July 2009. Land at Queensway Meadows was one of 40 sites visited by the Policy Review Group. It was identified that the industrial setting to the site with a number surrounding businesses and the presence of pylons and reens made it unsuitable for allocation.

The extensive process of establishing sufficient sites within Newport for allocation as Gypsy and Traveller Sites to meet an identified need is detailed in the Report of the Community Planning and Development Scrutiny Committee of 29 October 2012.

It is considered that the Report of the Community Planning and Development Scrutiny Committee adequately details that the proposed allocation Gypsy and Traveller Sites in the Revised Deposit Plan has been founded on a comprehensive and credible evidence base; that the likely impacts arising from the creation of a 'Transit site' have now been given adequate consideration. There is clear evidence to justify the allocation of land at Celtic Way, Coedkernew as a transit site; and a contingency site at Former Ringland Allotments for transit accommodation in the Revised Deposit Plan instead of land at Queensway Meadows. Land at Queensway Meadows is one of 16 sites proposed as an alternative site for allocation as a 'Gypsy and Traveller Transit Site' - with no sustainability appraisal submitted to support this assertion. Following thorough assessment in accordance with Welsh Assembly Guidance, the two sites identified under Policy H15 have been demonstrated to be suitable for allocation as 'Gypsy and Traveller Transit Sites' whereas Land at Queensway Meadows has been identified as being unsuitable. The provision of a contingency site at Former Ringland Allotments means that the policy is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances and so there is no need for any additional 'Transit Site' to be identified.

Any substitution of the Gypsy and Traveller Transit Sites identified by draft Policy H15 with Land at Queensway Meadows would result in a site that has been identified on a robust evidence base as being unsuitable for allocation replacing a site identified as suitable for allocation - which would make the policy 'unsound'. Accordingly, Land at Queensway Meadows should not be considered as suitable for allocation under Policy H15.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | Yes | | | | | |
| <p>Carlsberg UK Limited wish to reserve the right to speak if necessary, to facilitate thorough understanding of the key issues relating to allocation of Gypsy and Traveller Transit Sites and why Land at Queensway Meadows is unsuitable for allocation under policy H15.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

3683.K26 Natural Resources Wales 18/10/2013 E C M

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Concern regarding the particular vulnerability of G&T/caravan sites to flooding

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)001

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Queensway Meadows

3 3 Representation

TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15). The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability tidal flood outlines +

Contrary to ToS C2 and CE2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material Yes

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K10 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Support for allocation of land as transit G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)001 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Queensway Meadow | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support inclusion of this site for transit needs. It was part of the original LDP which Newport Council agreed was suitable. As far as I can see there is no justification for its removal other than political. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts As a resident directly affected I have valid questions & concerns to raise. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3888.K2 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Site at Queensway Meadows makes a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)001

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Queens Way Meadows

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

- RAS(N)008 Former Depot
- RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
- RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
- RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
- RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
- RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
- RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
- RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
- RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
- RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3889.K2 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Support for the G&T site suggested at Queensway Meadows.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)001 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Queens Way Meadow |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives. RAS(N)008 Former Depot RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner RAS(N)009 Former Speedway RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common RAS(N)051 Goldcliff |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K3 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Support use of Queensway Meadows as Gypsy and Traveller site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation Alternative sites I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas. RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows :- One of the better sites if the planned development is handled with commonsense allowing space from a camp whilst providing environmental space and beyond development space. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3891.K2 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Support proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Queens Way Meadow

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead.

RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadow

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3892.K2 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|---------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Site at Queensway Meadows is a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)001

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Queens Way Meadows

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

- RAS(N)008 Former Depot
- RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
- RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
- RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
- RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
- RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
- RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
- RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
- RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
- RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K5 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Support for allocation of land as G&T transit site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)001 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Queensway Meadow |
| 3 | 3 | Representation An original site that would have been previously successfully appraised by the Council as a transit site with no justification for its removal. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3996.K1 | Deninson, Mr Ron | | | 12/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Support the proposed alternative G&T site suggested at Queensway Meadows.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)001

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Queensway Meadows

3 3 Representation
Safer access (for travellers children). Rural area, prevent animosity amongst local community and local schools. Less interference for travellers.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why
No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4002.K1 | Dennison, Mr S | | | 13/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Comments on the Queensway Meadows Alternative Site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)001

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Queensway Meadows.

3 3 Representation
1. Unsociable noise too close proximity residents to site.
2. Beneficial to prevent school children clashing with travellers.
3. Prevention further flooding to Always area.
4. Safer for travellers and live stock.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4014.K1 | Shawyer, Ms Alison | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 497/ Queensway Meadows

Summary: Object to proposed gypsy and traveller site at Queensway Meadows

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)001 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Queensway Meadows Lliswerry | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Objection to the above site being used as a proposed Gypsy and Traveller site because: it is too close to a residential are. It is too close to a school. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why N/A | No |

Site,RepnType: 498/ Former Army Barracks,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K17 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: The local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows from proposed site but off-site sewers are required.

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site. Our local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows from the proposed site but off-site sewers are required. These can be provided by a sewer requisition scheme, under Sections 98 – 101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. No problems are envisaged at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites. | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3076.K2 | Storage Giant | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Former Army Barracks

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)004 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Army Barracks, Pye Corner | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation It is my view that the above named site at Pye Corner fails the C1 and C4 consistency test, because I cannot see that use of this land as a transit traveller site has taken into account the more relevant development and strategies in the Queensway Meadows area, or that it has taken account of community strategies. Also, I believe it fails CE2 coherence and effectiveness test, because NCC already have a number of more suitable transit sites to consider. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K27 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for G&T site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)004

2 2 Alternative Site Name
FormerArmy Barracks, Pye Corner

3 3 Representation

This proposed alternative site is within the Gwent Levels – Nash and Goldcliff SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of the special interest. It also has potential implications for the management of the SSSI. We would therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest.

In addition, it is likely that there are habitats and species of principle importance for biodiversity in Wales at the site that are included on the Section 42 List of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act. We remind you of your Authority's duty under section 40 of the NERC Act, to have regard to conserving biodiversity. Adverse effects on Section 42 interests should therefore be taken into consideration should you consider allocating the site in the LDP. This proposal is also contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas set out in the LDP.

TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15).

The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability tidal flood outlines +

Contrary to ToS P2, C2, CE1, CE2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material Yes

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K9 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Support for proposed allocation of land as G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)004 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former army barracks Pye Corner |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support the inclusion of this site for residential. As a former barracks the site will already have buildings - easy to convert and drainage etc. Surely it is more cost effective to convert existing buildings for utilities rather than start from scratch? Drainage is there - another cost saving! The council has an obligation to Newport rate payers to spend our budget in a reasonable & professional manner. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts As a resident directly affected I have valid concerns & questions to raise. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3888.K3 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Site at Former Army Barracks is a more suitable G&T site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)004

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Army Barrack.

3 3 Representation
The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

- RAS(N)008 Former Depot
- RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
- RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
- RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
- RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
- RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
- RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
- RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
- RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
- RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3889.K3 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Support the suggested G&T site at Former Army Barracks

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | |
|-----|--|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)004 |
|-----|--|

| | |
|-----|---|
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Army Barracks |
|-----|---|

| | |
|-----|----------------|
| 3 3 | Representation |
|-----|----------------|

I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
 RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
 RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
 RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
 RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
 RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
 RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
 RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
 RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
 RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K4 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Support use of Former Army Barracks as Gypsy and Traveller site

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | |
|-----|---|
| 3 3 | Representation Alternative site I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas. |
|-----|---|

RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks:- Another that would provide for a suitable residential site.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3891.K3 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Support use of Former Army Barracks at Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead.

RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3892.K3 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Former Army Barracks is a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)004

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Former Army Barracks

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
 RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
 RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
 RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
 RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
 RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
 RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
 RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
 RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
 RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K6 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Support for allocation of land as G&T residential site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)001 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Queensway Meadow |
| 3 | 3 | Representation An original site that would have been previously successfully appraised by the Council as a transit site with no justification for its removal. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3992.K1 | Sullivan, Mrs J | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | I | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Propose that the site at the Former Army Barracks is a preferable Gypsy and Traveller site to that at Hartridge Farm Road

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)004 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Army Barracks, Pye Corner | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have look at proposed sites for Gypsy Camp and feel that these three sites will have the least impact on surrounding residential areas. They are easily accessible and amenities are not far away. I fell that the Hartridge site is too close to an already troubled area, which is trying hard to improve. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | Yes |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4014.K6 | Shawyer, Ms Alison | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|---------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 498/ Former Army Barracks

Summary: Object to proposed gypsy and traveller site at Former Army Barracks

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)004 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Army Barracks, Pye Corner (this has come up under the Lliswerry Ward) | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Objection to the above site being used as a proposed Gypsy and Traveller site because: it is too close to a residential are. It is too close to a school. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why N/A | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

Site,RepnType: 499/ Former Army Camp,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K18 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: The local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows from the proposed site but off-site sewers are required.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site. Our local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows from the proposed site but off-site sewers are required. These can be provided by a sewer requisition scheme, under Sections 98 – 101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. No problems are envisaged at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3076.K3 | Storage Giant | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|---------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Former Army Camp

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)005

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Former Army Camp, Pye Corner

3 3 Representation

It is my view that the above named site at Pye Corner fails the C1 and C4 consistency test, because I cannot see that use of this land as a transit traveller site has taken into account the more relevant development and strategies in the Queensway Meadows area, or that it has taken account of community strategies. Also, I believe it fails CE2 coherence and effectiveness test, because NCC already have a number of more suitable transit sites to consider.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3205.K1 | Thomas Brothers | Derek Prosser Associates | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller use at Former Army Barracks Site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)005

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Army Camp, Pye Corner

3 3 Representation

I note that this site has been put forward as an alternative site with others for Gypsy and Traveller Residential Accommodation. This is presumably by a third party whose land has been identified in the Revised Local Development Plan for such use, as a way of deflecting interest from their own site.

This is despite this particular site being considered in some detail with others, by the Council's especially appointed Scrutiny Committee, and discounted for clear planning and operational reasons. Other sites are considered by the Council to be more appropriate and such a proposal would prejudice the development of this site for an anaerobic digester proposal, which is close to submission as a planning application following encouraging informal discussions with the Council's Planning Officers.

Appropriate alternative sites for such strategic recycling developments are rare and this alternative proposal should not be allowed to prejudice the anaerobic digester proposal.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K28 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Same comments as for RAS(N)004 (that is, concerns regarding vulnerability of G&T/caravan sites to flooding)

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)005 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Army Camp, Pye Corner | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Comments the same as those above for RAS(N)004. Contrary to ToS P2, C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional material and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material +For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K8 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Support for proposed allocation of land as residential G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)005 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former army camp, Pye Corner | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support inclusion of this site for residential use. This is again an original site from the previous LDP. Why has it been removed? I see no justification other than it must be political. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts As a resident directly affected I have valid concerns & questions to raise. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3888.K4 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Former Army Camp is a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)005

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Army Camp Pye Corner

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

- RAS(N)008 Former Depot
- RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
- RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
- RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
- RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
- RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
- RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
- RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
- RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
- RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3889.K4 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Support the G&T site suggested at Former Army Camp

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)005 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Army Camp Pye Corner |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives. |
|---|---|--|

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K5 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Support use of Former Army Camp as Gypsy and Traveller site.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | Representation Alternative site I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas. |
|---|---|---|

RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner :- As Army Barracks above.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3891.K4 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Support use of Former Army Camp site for Gypsy and Traveller use

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead.

RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3892.K4 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Former Army Camp is a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)005

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Former Army Camp Pye Corner

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot

RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows

RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks

RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner

RAS(N)009 Former Speedway

RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road

RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate

RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common

RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K7 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Support for allocation of land as G&T residential site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)004 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Army Barracks, Pye Corner | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation An original site that would have been previously successfully appraised by the Council as a residential site with no justification for its removal. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4014.K7 | Shawyer, Ms Alison | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Object to proposed gypsy and traveller site at Former Army Camp

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)005 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Army Camp, Pye Corner. (this has come up under Llisbury Ward) | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Objection to the above site being used as a proposed Gypsy and Traveller site because: it is too close to a residential are. It is too close to a school. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why N/A | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4019.K1 | Gapper, J A | | | 26/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|---------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 499/ Former Army Camp

Summary: Support Gypsy and Traveller site at former army camp

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RASN005 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name RASN055 | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have proposed the above as both sites are away from motorways and not too busy. The Ringland sites were not feasible because of the SDR flow of traffic. The allotment site is on a bad bend, and traffic is heavy from Llanwern School Site. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Site,RepnType: 500/ Former Speedway,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1420.K3 | Corus UK Ltd / Tata Steel UK Ltd | GVA Grimley | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Former Speedway

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We write in relation to the Alternative Sites Register (Revised Deposit Stage) published for consultation in September 2013. This submission follows previous representations made on behalf of our clients, Tata Steel, in relation to the emerging Local Development Plan (LDP). Our previous comments have been specifically concerned with the allocation of sites for future gypsy and traveller pitches. Having reviewed the Alternative Sites Register we would like to comment on two sites identified for potential new gypsy and traveller accommodation. The sites are the Former Speedway site (Ref: RAS(N)009) and Glan Llyn (Ref: RAS(N)036). The Alternative Site Schedule does not indicate whether the sites are put forward for transit or residential pitches (or both). We have set out the reasons for our clients objections to both sites below. We would also like to reiterate our support for the proposed deletion of the allocation for gypsy and traveller accommodation at Hartridge Farm Road under Policy H16. As previously stated in our representations to the Revised Deposit, the allocation of land at Hartridge Farm Road as a permanent residential site fails to meet the necessary tests of soundness and is unsound. Our reasons for objecting to Hartridge Farm Road were set out in detail in our response to the Revised Deposit Draft and have not been repeated here. The Former Speedway site was included in the original 'long list' of locations considered by the Scrutiny Committee for Community Planning and Development. The site was also included on a shortlist of eleven potential sites (for transit use only) that was consulted on in September/October 2012. An objection to the potential allocation of the site for gypsy and traveller provision was submitted as part of this consultation on behalf of our clients. Following the consultation process the site was rejected by the Scrutiny Committee and was subsequently not included in the Revised Deposit. We maintain the view that the Former Speedway site is not suitable for use as a gypsy and traveller transit site. The site does not accord with the guidance set out in the Welsh Government Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites in Wales (2009). The guidance notes that local authorities should avoid locating sites next to or near hazards which present specific risks to children and adults, such as industrial sites. Due to limited indoor space, it is recognised that the outdoor environment is particularly important to gypsy and traveller children. This adds to concerns regarding the suitability of locating a gypsy and traveller site next to existing industrial and commercial uses.

The Good Practice Guidance also notes that ultimately, if a location is considered inappropriate for residential use, then it should not be considered appropriate for a gypsy and traveller site. In the case of the Plover Close site, it would clearly not be suitable for residential use. A report to the Scrutiny Committee for Community Planning and Development in October 2012 recognised that "an application from a house-builder on this site would be rejected, unless part of a redevelopment of the wider industrial area." The report also recognises that "other sites were discounted from the shortlist for these same reasons." The Welsh Government Good Practice Guidance also notes that the same considerations that are applied to permanent residential sites should be applied to transit sites when considering site selection and location. The Council's own assessment suggests that the site is not suitable for a permanent residential site, which we would agree with. For the same reasons, however, we would also argue that the site is not a suitable location for a transit site. The location of the Former Speedway site would be inappropriate in terms of residential amenity, given concerns regarding noise and light pollution. During the site assessment process, the Scrutiny Committee also noted that access to services would be problematic given the need to cross a dual carriageway to access them. Aside from suitability, it is also questionable whether the site is available. The site is currently in active use and benefits from an extant planning permission for B1, B2 and B8 uses. The Scrutiny Committee report issued in October 2012 concluded that the Former Speedway site was less suitable than other preferred sites and it wasn't as accessible from the predominant transit routes used by gypsy and traveller families passing through Newport. Consideration was also given to concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposal on the delivery of Glan Llyn residential development and the importance of that project to Newport's regeneration and growth. As such, the Scrutiny Committee concluded that the site should not be included in the LDP. We support the conclusions of the Scrutiny Committee with regard to this site, and maintain that the site is not suitable for either residential or transit use. The potential of the Glan Llyn development to accommodate gypsy and traveller pitches was assessed as part of the 'long list' of potential sites considered by the Scrutiny Committee. The assessment noted that the site benefits from planning permission for a significant regeneration scheme, which is considered to be key to Newport's future growth. As such, the site was rejected and not included in future shortlists of potential sites.

As stated above, the developers responsible for Glan Llyn have previously raised concerns relating to impact of other proposed locations for gypsy and traveller sites on their development. These concerns were noted and taken into account by the Scrutiny Committee during the assessment process. Clearly the allocation of a gypsy and traveller site within the Glan Llyn development itself would have an even greater impact. Glan Llyn has been planned over a number of years with an agreed masterplan for its future development and initial phases now in place. Given the future development proposals the site is unlikely to be available or deliverable for the accommodation of gypsy and traveller sites. As such, the site should not be considered for the provision of gypsy and traveller pitches through the LDP.

In conclusion, we continue to support the deletion of Hartridge Farm Road as a proposed residential gypsy and traveller site. We also object to the proposed identification of the Former Speedway site and Glan Llyn for gypsy and traveller pitch provision. We would therefore ask the Council and Inspector to delete Hartridge Farm Road from the LDP and dismiss the proposed inclusion of the Former Speedway and Glan Llyn sites.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1466.K5 | St Modwen Developments Ltd | Savills | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Speedway

3 3 Representation
Please see covering letter, dated 9 September 2013.

We strongly object to the two sites (Glan Llyn and the Former Speedway) that have been forward by representors as gypsy and traveller sites as part of the Alternative Sites stage of the Revised Local Development Plan (RDLDP).

Glan Llyn is a hugely significant regeneration scheme and purposes the complete transformation of a major brownfield site. It has the support of all key stakeholders and planning permission based on a comprehensive and high quality masterplan which will deliver a substantial number of new homes together with many other social, economic and environmental benefits. As such, it is not possible or appropriate to allocate a site for gypsy and traveller uses.

The 'Former Speedway' site is unsuitable on planning grounds. The main reasons for this have fully considered and accepted by the Council. These are the site's location within an established and important industrial area which is at risk of flooding and which is next door to a strategic employment allocation. This site is also unsuitable due to its impact on Glan Llyn.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

Representations on Newport City Council's Alternative Sites Register (Revised Local Development Plan (RDLDP) Stage) Consultation
On behalf of St. Modwen Developments Limited

On behalf of St. Modwen Developments Limited (SMDL), Savills has submitted a number of representations (to all stages during the preparation of Newport's Local Development Plan (LDP) in relation to proposed gypsy and traveller sites. Having reviewed the Alternative Sites Register we wish to strongly object to two sites proposed by representors - the 'Former Speedway' and 'Glan Llyn' - as potential gypsy and traveller sites.

SMDL is the master developer of the Glan Llyn regeneration scheme and Persimmon Homes (Wales) Limited (PHWL) is in the process of building the first phase of new homes. The Glan Llyn concept aims to create a new high quality neighbourhood based on 4,000 new homes, significant open space, a local centre, new schools and new employment land (the Celtic Business Park) and other commercial, leisure and community uses). It will completely transform this previously developed site and the eastern gateway into the City and is one of Newport's (and South Wales') key regeneration projects. Outline planning permission for the scheme was granted in April 2010 which rests on a comprehensive masterplan that sees each of part of the site given a role and purpose. Significant progress has already been made against a backdrop of very difficult market conditions. The first phase is well underway and SMDL is keen to push forward with the second phase of development with a reserved matters application for the next phase of infrastructure and landscaping submitted to the Council in August 2013. All this demonstrates SMDL's continued commitment to the site and its future development.

In this context - with objectives and aspirations confirmed and agreed, masterplans prepared and with planning permissions in place - there is simply no scope for a different allocation on the Glan Llyn site. It is not promoted by St Modwen and is not deliverable or desirable.

With regard to the 'Former Speedway' site, representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (in May 2012) and the Revised Deposit LDP (RDLDP) (in July 2013) setting out our key concerns about this site (and some of the other allocations) and to ensure the decision made by the Council was soundly based on planning criteria.

The Council recognised these points and we were very pleased that the 'Former Speedway' allocation was not pursued in the RDLDP. However, for the same reasons it is important that the allocation is not resurrected now. On planning grounds the site is a clearly unsuitable place for any form of residential development (which is the key test when allocating sites for gypsy and travellers). The main reasons for this have been fully considered and accepted by the Council. These are the site's location within an established and important industrial area which is at risk of flooding and which is next door to a strategic employment allocation.

This means that the site cannot meet Welsh Government guidance and any application would fail because of:

- the noise and disturbance created by industrial processes and traffic - by existing users or by businesses that might set up there.
- the potential complaints from the site that could affect existing business users or adjacent land (or limit the uses or occupiers that could be attracted there)
- flood risk which is a recognised constraint.

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that was undertaken by Atkins as part of the LDP process reaffirms this view concluding that the 'Former Speedway' site should be discounted from further consideration because of its likely economic impact (on Glan Llyn), its location within Zone C1 floodplain, its lack of accessibility to Atkins' reference to the impact on Glan Llyn is important and is the second reason why the 'Former Speedway' site fails.

The Council is fully aware that it is very important that no projects are undertaken which affect or jeopardise the performance of Glan Llyn (including an alternative use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation). As stated above, the progress that has been made in difficult conditions is very encouraging, but those general conditions remain challenging. The last things the scheme needs is uncertainty or threat and this would be the consequence if ever the 'Former Speedway' site was resurrected as a potential gypsy and traveller site allocation.

The same is also true of course for an allocation on the Glan Llyn site.

For these reasons, we strongly object to the two sites referred to in this letter have been put forward as Alternative Sites by representors.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|---|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | Yes | | | | | |
| <p>Glan Llyn is the largest single housing site within the City. It is important that the developers are represented at the examination in order to ensure that we are involved in any discussion on potential gypsy and traveller sites.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

3076.K4 Storage Giant 09/09/2013 W M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Former Speedway

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Speedway

3 3 Representation
It is my view that the Former Speedway site at Plover Close fails the C1 and C4 consistency test, because I cannot see that use of this land as a transit traveller site has taken into account the more relevant development and strategies in the Queensway Meadows area, or that it has taken account of community strategies. Also, I believe it fails CE2 coherence and effectiveness test, because NCC already have a number of more suitable transit sites to consider.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

3663.K16 Newport CC Highways 17/10/2013 E M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)009 Former Speedway Lliswerry
Highway access is acceptable. However, the site is divorced from public transport provision and services required for the use. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3673.K4 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Comment regarding site constraints

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)009 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Speedway |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Adjacent to reen, Gwent Levels (Nash and Goldcliff) SSSI |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3677.K1 | J & B Sewing Machine Co Ltd | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at the Former Speedway.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Newport Speedway

3 3 Representation
We refer to the Alternative LDP Proposal ref: RAS(N)009.

The suggestion is that this land be used for Gypsy accommodation. (Former Newport Speedway).

As a major employer with premises immediately adjacent to this site (see our details below) we would respectfully suggest that this is an appalling proposal. The (regretfully) dishonest tendencies of the Gypsy Community, and their total disregard for hygiene and site cleanliness would have a serious negative effect on ours and other adjacent businesses.

We have had experience of the problems caused by illegal settling by Gypsies with theft from our premises, breakages of windows in our building, defecation and urination on our site, dumping of rubbish in the area requiring large scale clearing by the local authority, and generally anti-social behaviour.

A settlement at the proposed site would seriously put at risk our continuing occupation of our site and we would have to consider moving our business to another location outside of the borough.

Having employed people in Newport for 52 years this is not a state of affairs I wish to consider.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3678.K1 | Price, Mr Sam | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Suggest Gypsy and Traveller accommodation at Former Speedway Site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS (N) 009 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Speedway | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation My name is Sam Price your local Gypsy. My opinion is you have helped out the local Gypsies who live at Brickyard Lane. Now you need to help the other Gypsies that come and go in the area and need some where to stay womehere like - and for the permanent Gypsies and Travellers. SITE REF - RAS(N) 009 SITE NAME - Former Speedway RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION or/somewhere in the Spytty Area | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why My Letter enclosed | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K29 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Comments regarding SSSI status, flood risk and apparent absence of Sustainability Appraisal

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Speedway

3 3 Representation

The site is located adjacent to the Gwent Levels – Nash and Goldcliff SSSI and there may be interconnected drainage through ditches and reens between the proposed alternative site and the SSSI. There is therefore the potential for development at this site to have an indirect adverse impact on the SSSI.

We would therefore remind you of your authority's duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your' authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reasons of which the site is of special interest #

Notwithstanding the above, it does not seem that a Sustainability Appraisal has been supplied in support of this proposed allocation. Given the content of the Welsh Government's policy clarification letter CL-01-11 Local Development Plans – Sustainability appraisal procedure for alternative site representation, we therefore do not consider the proposed allocation complies with the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations.

TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15). The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines of the River Usk +

To meet ToS C2 & P2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | Yes | |
| <p># For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.</p> <p>We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.</p> <p>In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.</p> <p>+For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | No | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K12 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Support for proposed allocation of land as G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)009 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Speedway | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support inclusion of this site. This is a site the travellers have favoured. It had an excellent site approval. Again ... why was it removed? There is no justification. Too many back handers going on with the Glan Lyn estate? This is what Newport rate payers are wondering & questioning. Newport Council have the opportunity to please travellers & residents ... Why are they not taking it? | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts As a resident directly affected I have valid questions & concerns to raise. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3888.K5 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Former Speedway site is a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Speedway

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

- RAS(N)008 Former Depot
- RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
- RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
- RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
- RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
- RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
- RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
- RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
- RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
- RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3889.K5 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Support the suggested G&T site at Former Speedway.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)009 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Speedway |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
 RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
 RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
 RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
 RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
 RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
 RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
 RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
 RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
 RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K6 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Support use of Former Speedway as Gypsy and Traveller site.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | Representation Alternative site I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas. G/Ts preferred choice and clearly an ideal site in all respects. |
|---|---|---|

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3891.K5 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Support use of Former Speedway as Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead.

RAS(N)009 Former Speedway

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3892.K5 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Former Speedway is a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Former Speedway

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot

RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows

RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks

RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner

RAS(N)009 Former Speedway

RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road

RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate

RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common

RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3938.K5 | Newport Traveller Sites Study Group | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Family at Tatton Road should be relocated to site

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

The family at Tatton Road should be relocated at the former Speedway site RAS(N)009 which currently has no LDP allocation, and, not having been in either administration's list, is politically neutral. Being at the end of a cul de sac it would disturb no one and is strongly favoured by the travellers.

If the proposed sites do not find favour there are alternatives each side of the river.

As far as a transit site is concerned we suggest Newport City Council should engage in conversations with neighbouring Local Authorities for a joint site along the M4 corridor, and with Monmouthshire with regard to the former service station on the A449. The Study Group hopes these suggestions are helpful.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K8 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Support for allocation of land as a residential G&T site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Speedway

3 3 Representation
A site that is favoured by both travellers and the settled community as a residential site that has been unrealistically rejected even though it had a very favourable Site Appraisal.

4 4 Additional Material Yes

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes
All 15 sites listed ass attached

Highly emotive

The large number of residents represented by the group

The large number of residents supporting the group

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3996.K2 | Deninson, Mr Ron | | | 12/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Supports the alternative G & T site suggested at the Former Speedway site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Newport Speedway

3 3 Representation
Safer access (for travellers children). Rural area, prevent animosity amongst local community and local schools. Less interference travellers.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4001.K1 | Godsall, Mr A L | | | 13/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Support use of the Former Speedway site for G & T use

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Speedway

3 3 Representation
This is out of the way of housing - has good road access can be made secure.

4012.K3 Redmond, Mr Andrew

21/09/2013

W

O

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Speedway site.

Item Question Representation Text

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Speedway Site

3 3 Representation
Choosing one of the three above sites will damage the work done to improve the perception of the Ringland and Alway areas of Newport. A lot of time, effort and money have been invested in what has traditionally been seen as a 'rough' part of the city, and this will undo all of the good work done. People have invested their hard-earned money into the 'Broadheath' redevelopment and this will damage any trust in Newport City Council, especially as locating the travellers at any of the above sites will then affect the local housing prices. I also hope that a community known for its lack of contributions to the social funds (i.e. Tax, National Insurance etc.) are contributing to the cost of the works involved in creating such a site, and also be responsible for maintaining the facility to an agreed standard. I have no objection to their way of life, or their freedom to choose that way of life, but I do object to paying for it with my tax contributions. They should be either wholly responsible for the construction of such sites, or be made to contribute to the local community by paying rent and council tax whilst they are resident within the boundaries of the city.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4014.K4 | Shawyer, Ms Alison | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Former Speedway

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Speedway

3 3 Representation
Objection to the above site being used as a proposed Gypsy and Traveller site because: it is too close to a residential are. It is too close to a school.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why
N/A No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4060.K3 | McKim, Mrs Doreen | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 500/ Former Speedway

Summary: Supports proposed new Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Speedway

3 3 Representation
The travellers had already voiced their opinions at the meeting that they preferred the old speedway site. The allotment site isn't suitable as it is too near Ringland housing estate, as they (travellers) will entice trouble with gangs from Ringland going through the underpass causing a nightmare for the residents living near the underpass.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|---|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| Site,RepnType: 501/ Land at Tatton Road, | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K19 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: The local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows from the proposed site but off-site sewers are required.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site. Our local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows from the proposed site but off-site sewers are required. These can be provided by a sewer requisition scheme, under Sections 98 – 101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. No problems are envisaged at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3076.K5 | Storage Giant | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Land at Tatton Road

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)037

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land at Tatton Road

3 3 Representation

It is my view that the above named site at Tatton Road fails the C1 and C4 consistency test, because I cannot see that use of this land as a traveller site has taken into account the more relevant development and strategies in the Queensway Meadows area, or that it has taken account of community strategies. Also, I believe it fails CE2 coherence and effectiveness test, because NCC already have a number of more suitable transit sites to consider.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3673.K18 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Comments on proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Tatton Road

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Large area proposed, very difficult to comment on. However, a large portion of the area is the Gwent Levels SSSI and Solutia SINC which raises concerns. TPOs and TPO potential.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K30 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Comments regarding SSSI status, vulnerability of G&T/caravan sites to flooding and apparent absence of sustainability appraisal

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)037

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Tatton Road

3 3 Representation

It does not seem that a Sustainability Appraisal has been supplied in support of this proposed allocation. Given the content of the Welsh Government's policy clarification letter CL-01-11 Local Development Plans – Sustainability appraisal procedure for alternative site representation, we therefore do not consider the proposed allocation complies with the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations.

Notwithstanding the above, the precise location of the proposed alternative site is not defined in the supporting documents.

Tatton Road is in close proximity to the Gwent Levels – Nash and Goldcliff SSSI. However, given the lack of detail provided by the proponent in relation to the location of the proposed alternative site, we are unable to provide advice on any likely impact from any development at this site on the SSSI.

We would remind you of your authority's duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reasons of which the site is of special interest #

TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15). A precise location plan has not been provided., however the area around Tratto Road is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the Tratto Road area is within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines +

Contrary to ToS C2 & P2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | Yes | |
| <p># For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.</p> <p>We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.</p> <p>In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.</p> <p>+For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | No | |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3888.K6 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Site Tatton Road is a more suitable G&T.

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)047 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Tatton Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems. RAS(N)008 Former Depot RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner RAS(N)009 Former Speedway RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common RAS(N)051 Goldcliff | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3889.K6 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Support the suggested G&T site at Land at Tatton Road

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)037 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Tatton Road |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives. |
|---|---|--|

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
 RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
 RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
 RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
 RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
 RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
 RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
 RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
 RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
 RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3891.K6 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Support the use of Tatton Road as Gypsy and Traveller site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead. |
|---|---|--|

RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3892.K6 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Land a Tatton Road is a more suitable G&T site.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)037 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Tatton Road |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems. |
|---|---|--|

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
 RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
 RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
 RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
 RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
 RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
 RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
 RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
 RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
 RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3938.K4 | Newport Traveller Sites Study Group | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Family at the Transport Bridge should be relocated to this site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | Representation If no way can be found for the family at the transport Bridge site to remain undisturbed they should be relocated at the Tatton Road site RAS(N)037. Being a small family they could be located away from the power line. |
|---|---|---|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K17 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Support Site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A site at present used as a temporary site for travellers and favoured by both travellers and the settled community as as residential site if the site was set further south to avoid the existing pylons.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4014.K5 | Shawyer, Ms Alison | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 501/ Land at Tatton Road

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Tatton Road

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)037

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land at Tatton Road (this has come up under Lliswerry Ward)

3 3 Representation

Objection to the above site being used as a proposed Gyopsy and Traveller site because: it is too close to a residential are. It is too close to a school.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

N/A

Site,RepnType: 502/ Leeway Industrial Estate,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 357.K20 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 502/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: There may be instances where off-site watermains and sewers are required.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We are well placed to provide water supply and sewerage services to all sites within/adjacent to the Leeway Industrial Estate but there may be instances where off-site watermains and sewers are required.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3076.K6 | Storage Giant | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|---------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 502/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Leeway Industrial Estate

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)047

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Leeway Industrial Estate

3 3 Representation

It is my view that the above named site at Leeway Industrial Estate fails the C1 and C4 consistency test, because I cannot see that use of this land as a traveller accommodation has taken into account the more relevant development and strategies in the Queensway Meadows and Leeway area, or that it has taken account of community strategies. Also, I believe it fails CE2 coherence and effectiveness test, because NCC already have a number of more suitable sites to consider.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3156.K1 | Pendragon Plc | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 502/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | <i>Answer</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|--|---------------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)047 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Leeway Industrial Estate | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We strongly object to the proposed alternative site above, and request that it should be deleted as a potential site/ our Evans Halshaw Vauxhall dealership (on Spytty Road) is in the vicinity of the site and our concerns extend to the extra pressure on services in the area and also the road network, traffic flow and road safety. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K31 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 502/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Comment regarding particular vulnerability of G&T/caravan sites to flooding

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)047 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Leeway Industrial Estate | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15). The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines + (See additional information and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material +For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K5 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 502/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Support proposed allocation of land as G&T site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)047

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Tatton Road

3 3 Representation
I support inclusion of this site. The travellers are happy with this site albeit they would prefer to move further south away from the pylons - easily accomodated. Again an opporunity to please travellers & non travellers. Please review.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why
All parts

As a resident directly affected I have valid questions & concerns to raise.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K7 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|---------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 502/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Support use of Leeway Industrial Estate as Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Alternative site I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas.

RAS(N) 047 Land at Tatton Road. Suitable and occupied by G/Ts who would be happy there if to be moved away from the nation grid equipment.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K9 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 502/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Support for allocation of land as a residential G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|---|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)047 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Tatton Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation A site at present used as a temporary site for travellers and favoured by both travellers and the settled community as a residential site if the site was set further south to avoid the existing pylons. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4014.K3 | Shawyer, Ms Alison | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 502/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Object to gypsy and traveller site at Leeway Industrial Estate

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)047 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Leeway industrial estate |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Objection to the above site being used as a proposed Gypsy and Traveller site because: it is too close to a residential are. It is too close to a school. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why N/A |

Site,RepnType: 503/ Former Tipping Area,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K6 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|--------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 503/ Former Tipping Area

Summary: In order to develop this site extensive off-site main for water and sewerage would be required

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation It should be noted that there is no public water supply to the sites and there are no public sewers in this area. In order to develop this site extensive off-site mains for water and sewerage would be required, which may be expensive for developers. However, this is achievable through requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended). Where any proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3673.K27 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 503/ Former Tipping Area

Summary: Comments on proposed development at Former Tipping Area, Llanwern

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Spencer Works 3 SINC. Immediately adjacent to Gwent Levels SSSI. Public access and cycleway on northern boundary.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K25 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 503/ Former Tipping Area

Summary: Concerns regarding site characteristics and constraints (particularly SSSI status)

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)054

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Tipping Area

3 3 Representation

The site is located adjacent to the Gwent Levels – Nash and Goldcliff SSSI and there may be interconnected drainage through ditches and reens between the proposed alternative site and the SSSI. There is therefore the potential for development at this site to have an indirect adverse impact on the SSSI.

We would therefore remind you of your authority's duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reasons of which the site is of special interest #

The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability tidal flood outlines of the Severn Estuary +

Contrary to ToS C2 and CE2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | | Yes |
| <p># For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.</p> <p>We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.</p> <p>In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.</p> <p>+For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4032.K2 | Tariq, Mr Muhammad | | | 01/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 503/ Former Tipping Area

Summary: Supports proposed residential, hotel and roadside uses

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
Not provided

2 2 Alternative Site Name
RAS(N)054

3 3 Representation
Both of the above sites for their planned usage is supported.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K22 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: There may be instance where off-site watermain and sewers are required.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
We are well placed to provide water supply and sewerage services to all sites within/adjacent to the Leeway Industrial Estate but there may be instances where off-site watermain and sewers are required.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3076.K8 | Storage Giant | | | 01/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)059

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land within / adjacent Leeway Industrial Estate

3 3 Representation
It is my view that the above named site on the Leeway Industrial Estate fail the C1 and C4 consistency test, because I cannot see that use of this land as traveller Accommodation has taken into account the more relevant development and strategies in this area, or that it has taken account of community strategies. Also, I believe it fails CE2 coherence and effectiveness test, because NCC already have a number of more suitable transit sites to consider.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K30 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Comments on proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Leeway Industrial Estate

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Allocations to east of Nash Road are within Solutia SINC. Regenerating Woodland.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K32 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Comment regarding particular vulnerability of G&T/caravan sites to flooding

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)059 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15). The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines + (See additional information and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material +For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K13 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Support for proposed allocation of land as transit and residential G&T sites

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)059 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land within/adjcent to Leeway Industrial Estate | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support inclusion of these sites as they have good potential for transit/residential use. Travellers state they want to be private and "out of the way of non travellers" - this area is ideal. Close enough to shops/doctors but far enough away to give them their privacy (for illegal activity such as Human Trafficking) that we have all seen on the BBC News from the Cardiff Site. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts As a resident directly affected I have valid concerns & questions to raise. | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3888.K7 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Site at Leeway Industrial Estate would make a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)059

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate

3 3 Representation
The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

- RAS(N)008 Former Depot
- RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
- RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
- RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
- RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
- RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
- RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
- RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
- RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
- RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3889.K7 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Support the G&T site suggested at Leeway Industrial Estate.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)059 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives. |
|---|---|--|

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
 RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
 RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
 RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
 RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
 RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
 RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
 RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
 RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
 RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K8 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Support land within adjacent/to Leeway Industrial Estate for Gypsy and Traveller site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | Representation Alternative site I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas. |
|---|---|---|

RAS(N)059 Land Within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate. Another site that is adequately satisfactory.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3891.K7 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Support use of land within Leeway Industrial Esatate for Gypsy and Traveller site.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead.

RAS(N)059

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3892.K7 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Land at Leeway Industrial Estate is more suitable Gypsy and Traveller site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)059

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

- RAS(N)008 Former Depot
- RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
- RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
- RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
- RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
- RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
- RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
- RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
- RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
- RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K10 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Support for allocation of land as transit or residential G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)059 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Sites that have good potential as either Transit or Residential sites. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4014.K2 | Shawyer, Ms Alison | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 504/ Leeway Industrial Estate

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Leeway Industrial Estate

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)059 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Objection to the above site being used as a proposed Gypsy and Traveller site because: it is too close to a residential area. It is too close to a school. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why N/A | No |

Site,RepnType: 505/ Land East of Claremont and Pilton Vale,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K15 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 505/ Land East of Claremont and Pilton Vale

Summary: Northern part of site would not be sustainable - further detail required to establish full impact.

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)038 Land east of Claremont and Pilton Vale Malpas It is not clear if the proposed site directly abuts a public highway. If not then vehicular access into the site may not be possible. Vehicular access does not appear feasible due to the topography of the site and woodland/dense vegetation. Both Pilton Vale and Claremont estates bounding the site have been designed with vehicular access to the rear and footpath access to the front. This is not conducive to any additional form of residential development in the area. Any single access from Pillmawr Road will lead to a long linear form of development which is against the ethos of inclusive grid design required by manual for streets. Emergency access arrangement will need to be clarified and agreed for such a linear development. The northern part of the site is not located within 400 metres of a bus route let alone a bus stop. The site is currently located in Zone 6 of the parking standards. Should any development be approved the northern section of the site is anticipated to remain in Zone 6 and so would not be sustainable. The southern portion of the site is anticipated to be reallocated to Zone 4. | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3673.K19 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 505/ Land East of Claremont and Pilton Vale

Summary: Comments on proposed residential development at Claremont and Pilton Vale

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

2 SINCS – Pilton Vale Brook and Pilton Vale East. Ancient Semi Natural Woodland. Site is public open space and Accessible Natural Green Space. PROW adjacent to site. Potential TPO current protected status of trees.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3683.K33 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 505/ Land East of Claremont and Pilton Vale

Summary: Objection to the proposed allocation of land for residential use/development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)038 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land East of Claremont & Pilton Vale |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside/ Green wedge (Greenfield) site*

This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape as set out in the LDP and undermines the allocation of the area as a Green Wedge, the aim of which is to retain the openness of the area.

The site is partially located within Zone C2, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the site to be partially within the 1% (1 in 100 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines ++

Contrary to ToS P2, C2, CE1, CE2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

| | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

Site,RepnType: 506/ Pound Hill,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 47.K1 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Do not support the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Pound Hill.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

New Sites Proposed by Representators to be included in the LDP RAS(N)003 Pound Hill Coedkernew Proposed – Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Current LDP Allocation – Countryside and Green Wedge We can find no attributes to support the proposed use of the site at Pound Hill as a gypsy and traveller transit site. The site is currently designated as Countryside and Green Wedge. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. The proposed site is adjacent to a dual carriageway and the M4 motorway, which falls outside of the criteria for shortlisting of gypsy and traveller sites. Access on and off the A48 is wholly unsuitable for towing vehicles, particularly given the high accident rate on this dual carriageway over the years. The site is also not on level land and unsuitable for large, heavy vehicle to access. We understand there is no public sewer connection on the site so the siting of septic tanks would be needed. Notwithstanding the fact that the local primary school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed, the school does not offer the necessary provision for the needs of the children from gypsy and traveller communities. The immediate area is also lacking in the necessary amenities such as grocery shops, pharmacy, We do not believe the land to be owned by Newport City Council, making any proposed development slow and expensive.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K21 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: The nearest public sewer is over a kilometre away, requiring extensive off-site sewers to be laid.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site, but this will require the provision of off-site mains to be laid to the boundary of the site. These can be provided by a water requisition scheme, under Sections 41 – 44 of the Water Industry Act 1991. It should be noted that the nearest public sewer is over 1000m away, requiring extensive off-site sewers to be laid. An alternative means of sewerage disposal may be considered and we would recommend consultation with Natural Resources Wales.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1600.K1 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Pound Hill

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)003
This site has already been assessed in the Scrutiny process and found to be unsuitable on highways, topography, cost and other grounds and should be rejected.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3412.K1 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|---------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Pound Hill

3 3 Representation
None of these sites seem appropriate either because of access or location and 3 of the 4 sites would put additional pressure on already stretched services in Marshfield, particularly the school, shop, other amenities and roads.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K1 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Pound Hill, Coedkernew

3 3 Representation
Proposed – Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

Current LDP Allocation – Countryside and Green Wedge

I do not support the proposed use of the site at Pound Hill as a gypsy and traveller transit site. The site is currently designated as Countryside and Green Wedge. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. The proposed site is adjacent to a dual carriageway and the M4 motorway, which falls outside of the criteria for shortlisting of gypsy and traveller sites. Access on and off the A48 is wholly unsuitable for towing vehicles, particularly given the high accident rate on this dual carriageway over the years. The site is also not on level land and unsuitable for large, heavy vehicle to access.

Notwithstanding the fact that the local primary school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed, the school does not offer the necessary provision for the needs of the children from gypsy and traveller communities. The immediate area is also lacking in the necessary amenities such as grocery shops, pharmacy, dentist etc.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K17 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)003 Pound Hill Coedkernew

This site was previously considered for this use and determined as possible. However, Pound Hill is narrow with a steep gradient and is unsuitable for some of the towing vehicles anticipated. The site slopes towards the A48 such vehicles entering or leaving the site onto Pound Hill risk grounding. Direct access onto the A48 is not acceptable. Any new access onto Pound Hill will require the loss of an extensive length of trees. There are no services or facilities in the vicinity of the site such this is not a sustainable location for the proposed use. The site is located in Zone 6 of the Parking Guidelines.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K34 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for G&T transit site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)003 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Pound Hill Coedkernew | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation It does not seem that a Sustainability Appraisal has been supplied in support of this proposed allocation. Given the content of the Welsh Government's policy clarification letter CL-01-11 Local Development Plans - Sustainability appraisal procedure for alternative site representation, we therefore do not consider the proposed allocation complies with the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed alternative site is located within an area designated as Green Wedge in the Revised Deposit LDP. Paragraph 33 of WAGC30/07 - Planning for Gypsy And Traveller caravan sites Circular states that new Gypsy and Traveller sites in green wedges are likely to be inappropriate development. Alternatives should be explored before Green Belt or green wedge locations are considered. Contrary to ToS P2 & C2 | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3692.K8 | Lawrence, Tracey | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Objection of proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Pound Hill

3 3 Representation

This site was previously removed from the list due to the topography of the land and very poor access. The land would have to be excavated, levelled and access improved to accommodate a G&T transit site.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

3849.K1 Suller, Cllr Tom

18/10/2013

E

O

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Pound Hill

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)003

This site has already been assessed in the Scrutiny process and found to be unsuitable on highways, topography, cost and other grounds and should be rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3861.K2 | Cassidian Limited | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | |
|-----|--|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)003 |
|-----|--|

| | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name Pound Hill |
|-----|-------------------------------------|

| | |
|-----|--|
| 3 3 | Representation Cassidian Limited objects to the proposal to change the current LDP allocation of this site from Countryside and Green Wedge to Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation for the following reasons: Newport has an abundance of more suitable vacant sites closer to facilities and within defined settlement boundaries, without the necessity of re-designating Countryside and Green Wedge land. It is government policy, wherever possible, to regenerate City Centre sites in preference to development in the Countryside. |
|-----|--|

| | | |
|-----|---------------------|----|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | No |
|-----|---------------------|----|

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|-----|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4048.K1 | Birchall, Professor James | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 506/ Pound Hill

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | |
|-----|--|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)003 |
|-----|--|

| | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name Pound Hill |
|-----|-------------------------------------|

| | |
|-----|---|
| 3 3 | Representation The new sites proposed under part A as RAS(N)003, RAS(N)007, RAS(N)016 and RAS(N) 018 are clearly inappropriate. There is insufficient local resources (healthcare, education, retail) to accommodate gypsy traveller sites in this area. Situating such sites very close to fast-moving highways also represents a significant danger. |
|-----|---|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| Site,RepnType: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club, | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| 47.K2 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | W | | M | |
|--------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Do not support the site for Gypsy and Traveller us at Land near Peterstone Lakes

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lake Golf Club Proposed – Gypsy and Traveller Residential Accommodation Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area, Undeveloped Coastal Zone, part Green Wedge and part Green Belt. We can find no attributes to support the site identified as Land Near Peterstone Lake Golf Club as a gypsy and traveller residential site. Without an exact location, specific comment is difficult however the nature of this area would make it isolated from the necessary amenities such as grocery shops, pharmacy, dentist and post office. Public transport does not serve this location making this site wholly unsuitable as a gypsy and traveller residential site. The site is currently designated as Countryside Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive Green Wedge and undeveloped coastal zone which emphasises the unsuitability of this proposal. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. This site is also in close proximity to the sea wall and falls within the flood risk area. Notwithstanding the fact that the local primary school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed, the school does not offer the necessary provision for the needs of the children from gypsy and traveller communities. The road network to this site is unsuitable for both the additional volume and type of traffic associated with a gypsy and traveller site. We do not believe the land to be owned by Newport City Council, making any proposed development slow and expensive.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 55.K2 | Wentloog Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

Site Name – Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club RAS (N) 007

Wentlooge Community Council (WCC) finds it difficult to understand how Newport City Council (NCC) has included such vague proposals without any one specific site or group of sites being identified. This appears contrary to the Town and Country Planning Act (Wales) 2005 - Section 20 (c) (i) which clearly indicates that 'a' (or 'the') site should be identified and specifically that an 'address' should be given.

Wentlooge Community Council is therefore forced to address the issue of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation in broad terms across the whole of the map area albeit focussing 'near' Peterstone Lakes Golf Club.

Wentlooge Community Council objects to Alternative Site proposals RAS(N) 007 – Land near to Peterstone Lakes Golf Club for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation in its entirety for the following reasons:-

Introduction (WCC's past experience of Gypsy/Traveller sites on the Levels)

NCC has previously refused numerous (often retrospective) applications for such accommodation on adjoining land(s) following consents for change of use from 'Agricultural' to 'the keeping of horses, stable(s) and field shelter' or when Gypsies or Travellers have simply sited static caravan(s) on land without any previous permission(s) at all.

The majority of sites, especially those near to Peterstone Lakes Golf Club, do not have any infrastructure, being far out from the local settlement boundary: in many cases there are no mains services, water, gas, electricity or waste collection.

Many developments of this nature include the use of a cess pool (and often it's retrospective application for permission). The Community Council would always be anxious/object to such cess pools being located near to reens and would highlight the need to comply with Council regulations, as well as those of the Environment Agency and Countryside Council for Wales (now amalgamated as NRW), as the area is a SSSI.

There are also numerous trees within the area indicated and the Community Council is concerned that these are kept/maintained to help preserve/enhance the countryside.

UDP/LDP

This Alternative Site(s) proposal is contrary to many provisions of the Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 and the Revised Local Development Plan 2011 - 2026: The Alternative Site proposed is situated outside of the Peterstone Settlement boundary and is designated as 'open countryside' and green wedge (SP5 and SP7).

The Alternative Site proposed/proposed development will be in many cases inappropriate in the countryside by reason of scale and appearance. Many clauses of the UDP/LDP are designed to protect the Wentlooge levels from such development that is not related to agriculture.

Specifically many of these Gypsy and Traveller developments include high gates, large expanses of hardcore and the timber panel fencing and are not in keeping with the area, especially the agricultural area of the levels. Developments in the past have been forced to remove high fencing (e.g. The Pigeon Loft) and/or gates and hardcore (e.g. Land to the east of Blue House Lane – Appeal Ref: APP/G6935/C/10/2136691-2).

The Alternative Site(s) proposed are also, in addition to being in open countryside and an undeveloped coastal zone, a Landscape of Historic Interest SLA (Register of Landscapes of Historic Interest in Wales), an Area of Special Archaeological interest ASA and adjacent to the major Ramsar site of the Wentlooge Levels / Severn Estuary.

The Wentlooge Levels are a unique area which need to be maintained effectively, as stated by it's inclusion in the Special Sites of Scientific Interest and designation as Green Wedge.

Developments such as those suggested of Gypsy and Traveller sites could have a major impact on the ecological value on the reen systems. It would be reprehensible to see this unique landscape with its particular agriculture and wildlife threatened, as well as assisting the merging of the cities of Cardiff and Newport through further reduction of the Green Belt or Green Wedge.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Wentlooge Community Council would particularly bring Newport City Council's, and any future Planning Inspector's, attention to the policies and provisions of the Revised LDP 2011 - 2026 viz:-

Plan Objectives

Objective 1 – Sustainable Use of Land

To ensure that all development makes the most efficient use of natural resources by seeking to locate development in the most sustainable locations, minimise the impact on the environment and make a positive contribution to local communities.

A key way in which the Plan will seek to meet this objective is by focusing development on previously used, brownfield sites.

(i.e. not green field sites in the open countryside of the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

Objective 2 – Climate Change

To ensure that development and land uses in Newport make a positive contribution to minimising, adapting to or mitigating against the causes and impacts of climate change, by incorporating the principles of sustainable design, changes to travel behaviour, managing the risks and consequences of flooding, and improving efficiency in the use of energy, waste and water.

(i.e. not locating development in C1 floodplains such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

Objective 6 – Conservation of the Natural Environment

To protect and enhance the quality of the natural environment, including landscape, protected habitats and species of principal importance for biodiversity in Wales (regardless of greenfield or brownfield status) and the protection of controlled waters.

The Green Belt between Marshfield and Cardiff is the first area of statutory Green Belt in Wales. This was designated in the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996 – 2011 following earlier regional collaboration through SEWSPG on Green Belt issues around the capital. The Green Belt will continue to be protected throughout this Plan period, and will also be expanded slightly.

(i.e. not locating further development for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in Green Belt /Wedge such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

Spatial Strategy

Key elements of the Revised LDP's spatial strategy are to maximise the use of brownfield sites in the interests of sustainability, regeneration, community cohesion, and urban form; and to protect the landscape, including maintaining, and slightly extending, the statutory Green Belt on the Cardiff boundary; to conserve protected sites and species, and encourage biodiversity;

SP1 Sustainability

PROPOSALS WILL BE REQUIRED TO MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT BY CONCENTRATING DEVELOPMENT IN SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS ON BROWNFIELD LAND WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY.

The planning system is primarily concerned with the use of land so one of the key actions that can be taken to achieve sustainable development is to focus on reusing previously developed land, and making the best use of facilities and services, as opposed to developing on greenfield sites. As well as safeguarding countryside and other green areas, this will also tend to result in a more compact form of development, that can make use of existing physical and social infrastructure, and where public transport, walking and cycling are viable alternatives to the car.

(i.e. specifically not developing Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in green field sites in open countryside such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP3 Flood Risk

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

NEWPORT'S COASTAL AND RIVERSIDE LOCATION NECESSITATES THAT DEVELOPMENT BE DIRECTED AWAY FROM AREAS WHERE FLOOD RISK IS IDENTIFIED AS A CONSTRAINT AND ENSURE THAT THE RISK OF FLOODING IS NOT INCREASED ELSEWHERE. DEVELOPMENT WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED IN FLOOD RISK AREAS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL GUIDANCE WHERE APPROPRIATE A DETAILED TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT WILL BE REQUIRED TO ENSURE THAT THE DEVELOPMENT IS DESIGNED TO COPE WITH THE THREAT AND CONSEQUENCES OF FLOODING OVER ITS LIFETIME. SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS TO MANAGE FLOOD RISK SHOULD BE PRIORITISED.

Flood risk management is a clear consideration for the LDP due to Newport's coastal location, the River Usk and the complex reen systems on the Gwent Levels. The tidal limit of the Usk extends beyond Newport's boundary making tidal and fluvial flood risk a key concern for a high proportion of the Authority area. In addition to tidal and fluvial flood risk developers must also consider their affect on surface, groundwater and flood risk from artificial sources, including reservoirs and canals. Watercourses within the Internal Drainage Board (IDB) area must not be culverted and development must avoid obstructing the water course by providing a buffer zone of 12.5m minimum for reens and 7m minimum for field ditches in order to allow ongoing maintenance. It is recommended that developers seek advice and information from the Natural Resources Wales, Local Authority and Internal Drainage Board where relevant.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in C1 floodplains and complex reen systems such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP5 Countryside

DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE (THAT IS, THAT AREA OF LAND LYING BEYOND THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES SHOWN ON THE PROPOSAL AND INSET MAPS) WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED WHERE THE USE IS APPROPRIATE IN THE COUNTRYSIDE. RESPECTS THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AND BIODIVERSITY OF THE IMMEDIATE AND SURROUNDING AREA AND IS APPROPRIATE IN SCALE AND DESIGN. HOUSING DEVELOPMENT, RURAL DIVERSIFICATION AND RURAL ENTERPRISE USES, BEYOND SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES, WILL ONLY BE APPROPRIATE WHERE THEY COMPLY WITH NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY.

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.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in green field sites in open countryside such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP6 Green Belt

THE GREEN BELT IS MAINTAINED ALONG THE NEWPORT – CARDIFF BOUNDARY AND EXTENDED NORTHWARDS TO THE M4 MOTORWAY. WITHIN THIS AREA DEVELOPMENT WHICH PREJUDICES THE OPEN NATURE OF THE LAND WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.

The green belt that lies between Marshfield and Cardiff was designated, following regional discussions, by the Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996 – 2011 as the first green belt in Wales. Green belts are normally expected to have a life beyond that of one development Plan, so the existing green belt is maintained and a small addition made to extend it northwards to the M4 motorway to provide a more logical and distinct boundary. The extension is also considered necessary to respond to development within the Local Authority area, and pressure for development within the neighbouring Local Authority of Cardiff nearest the Newport boundary.

The Newport – Cardiff gap, being only about 3 miles wide in places, and sitting between two of the only five cities of Wales, is crucial to the maintenance of urban form. There is no appetite for the cities to merge, and indeed much public support for the maintenance of this gap and the separate identity of the cities.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in Green Belt such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP7 Green Wedges

GREEN WEDGES HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED IN ORDER TO PREVENT COALESCENCE BETWEEN THE FOLLOWING SETTLEMENTS: NEWPORT AND CARDIFF - WITHIN THESE AREAS DEVELOPMENT WHICH PREJUDICES THE OPEN NATURE OF THE LAND WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Green Wedges have been designated on a common basis with the other local planning authorities in South Wales. The prime purpose of Green Wedges is to prevent coalescence between urban areas. The designation is not made necessarily on the basis of the physical quality of the landscape, but rather to maintain their openness. The areas designated tend to have significant importance for their openness and for their role in maintaining the distinct identify of separate communities.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in Green Wedges such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP8 Special Landscape Areas

SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS ARE DESIGNATED AS FOLLOWS WITHIN WHICH PROPOSALS WILL BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE POSITIVELY TO THE AREA THROUGH HIGH QUALITY DESIGN, MATERIALS AND MANAGEMENT SCHEMES THAT DEMONSTRATE A CLEAR APPRECIATION OF THE AREA'S SPECIAL FEATURES: WENTLOOGE LEVELS

Within Special Landscape Areas, priority will be given to landscape conservation and enhancement. The designation of a SLA does not preclude development but any proposals must demonstrate that they have been designed to respect the valued characteristics of the recognised landscape as well as being in accordance with other Policies of this Plan.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in SLAs such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP9 Conservation of the Natural, Historic and Built Environment

THE CONSERVATION, ENHANCEMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF RECOGNISED SITES WITHIN THE NATURAL, HISTORIC AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT WILL BE SOUGHT IN ALL PROPOSALS.

(i.e. discouraging development in the natural environment of the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

General Development Principles

GP1 General Development Principles – Climate Change

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD:

BE DESIGNED TO WITHSTAND THE PREDICTED CHANGES IN THE LOCAL CLIMATE AND TO REDUCE THE RISK OF FLOODING ON SITE AND ELSEWHERE, UNLESS THE RISK AND CONSEQUENCES OF FLOODING ARE DEMONSTRATED AS BEING ACCEPTABLY MANAGED, INCLUDING THE AVOIDANCE OF NON-PERMEABLE HARD SURFACES;

Development proposals may not only be at risk of flooding themselves, but may also exacerbate existing or create new flooding problems on other land or property through reductions in floodplain storage capacity or by impeding flood flows.

(i.e. discouraging development in C1 floodplains and complex reed systems such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

GP2 General Development Principles – General Amenity

DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE, AS APPLICABLE:

i) THERE WILL NOT BE A SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECT ON LOCAL AMENITY, INCLUDING IN TERMS OF NOISE, DISTURBANCE, PRIVACY, OVERBEARING, LIGHT, ODOURS AND AIR QUALITY;

ii) THE PROPOSED USE AND FORM OF DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE VISUAL AMENITIES OF NEARBY OCCUPIERS OR THE CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE OF THE SURROUNDING AREA;

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

iii) THE PROPOSAL SEEKS TO DESIGN OUT THE OPPORTUNITY FOR CRIME AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR;

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the Wentlooge Levels that would have such detrimental effects - the known results of the impact of Gypsy and Traveller Sites in the past - WCC)

GP5 General Development Principles – Natural Environment

DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE, AS APPLICABLE:

i) THE PROPOSALS ARE DESIGNED AND MANAGED TO PROTECT AND ENCOURAGE BIODIVERSITY AND ECOLOGICAL CONNECTIVITY, INCLUDING THROUGH THE INCORPORATION OF NEW FEATURES ON OR OFF SITE TO FURTHER THE UK, WELSH AND/OR NEWPORT BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLANS;

ii) THE PROPOSALS DEMONSTRATE HOW THEY AVOID, OR MITIGATE AND COMPENSATE NEGATIVE IMPACTS TO BIODIVERSITY, ENSURING THAT THERE ARE NO SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS ON AREAS OF NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST INCLUDING INTERNATIONAL, EUROPEAN, NATIONAL, WELSH SECTION 4239 AND LOCAL PROTECTED HABITATS AND SPECIES, AND PROTECTING FEATURES OF IMPORTANCE FOR ECOLOGY;

iii) THE PROPOSAL WILL NOT RESULT IN AN UNACCEPTABLE IMPACT ON WATER QUALITY;

iv) THE PROPOSAL SHOULD NOT RESULT IN THE LOSS OR REDUCTION IN QUALITY OF HIGH QUALITY AGRICULTURAL LAND (GRADES 1, 2 AND 3A);

v) THERE WOULD BE NO UNACCEPTABLE IMPACT ON LANDSCAPE QUALITY;

vi) THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES AN APPROPRIATE LANDSCAPE SCHEME, WHICH ENHANCES THE SITE AND THE WIDER CONTEXT INCLUDING GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND BIODIVERSITY NETWORKS;

vii) THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES APPROPRIATE TREE PLANTING OR RETENTION WHERE APPROPRIATE AND DOES NOT RESULT IN THE UNACCEPTABLE LOSS OF OR HARM TO TREES, WOODLAND OR HEDGEROWS THAT HAVE WILDLIFE OR AMENITY VALUE.

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the Wentlooge Levels that would have such detrimental effects - the known results of the impact of Gypsy and Traveller Sites in the past - WCC)

CE1 Development in the Green Belt and Green Wedges

IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE OPEN CHARACTER OF THE GREEN BELT AND GREEN WEDGES, DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED FOR:

i) AGRICULTURAL OR FORESTRY USES;

ii) ESSENTIAL FACILITIES FOR OUTDOOR SPORT AND OUTDOOR RECREATION;

iii) LIMITED EXTENSION, ALTERATION OR REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING DWELLINGS WITHIN THEIR EXISTING CURTILAGE;

iv) OTHER USES OF LAND WHICH MAINTAIN THE OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT AND WHICH DO NOT CONFLICT WITH THE PURPOSE OF INCLUDING LAND WITHIN IT;

PROPOSALS SHOULD NOT PREJUDICE THE PURPOSES OF THE GREEN BELT/GREEN WEDGE BY REASON OF THEIR SCALE, SITING, MATERIALS OR DESIGN. VISUAL AMENITIES OF THE GREEN BELT/GREEN WEDGE SHOULD NOT BE HARMED BY PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN OR CONSPICUOUS FROM THEM.

The most important attribute of the Green Belt/Green Wedges is their openness, and development within them will be strictly controlled. Development of an urban nature will not therefore be appropriate or any other form of development that would erode the essential openness of the land.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the Wentlooge Levels that would have any such detrimental effects - WCC)

CE5 Historic Landscapes, Parks, Gardens and Battlefields

SITES INCLUDED IN THE REGISTER OF LANDSCAPES, PARKS AND GARDENS OF SPECIAL HISTORIC INTEREST AND HISTORIC BATTLEFIELDS SHOULD BE PROTECTED, CONSERVED, ENHANCED AND WHERE APPROPRIATE, RESTORED. ATTENTION WILL ALSO BE GIVEN TO THEIR SETTING

The Register of Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales identifies the Gwent Levels as an area which is uniquely rich in archaeological and historical resource. The Register does not preclude development but as advised in Welsh Office Circular 61/96, it should be used in determining planning applications where the development is of a sufficient scale to have more than a local impact on the historic landscape. Such developments may require an Environmental Impact Assessment. Therefore an Assessment of the Significance of the Impact of Development on Historic Landscape (ASIDOHL2) will be required and the outcomes implemented for those developments deemed to have more than a local impact on the historic landscape.

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the SLA of the Wentlooge Levels that would have any such detrimental effects - WCC)

CE7 Archaeology

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL NORMALLY BE REQUIRED TO UNDERTAKE AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT BEFORE THE PROPOSAL IS DETERMINED:

i) WHERE GROUNDWORKS AND/OR THE INSTALLATION OF SERVICES ARE PROPOSED WITHIN THE ARCHAEOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE AREAS OF CAERLEON, THE LEVELS, LOWER MACHEN AND THE CITY CENTRE, OR;

ii) WITHIN OTHER AREAS OF RECOGNISED ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST.

Welsh Office Circulars 60/9668 and 61/9669 place an onus on developers to consider the impact of their proposals on archaeology. Archaeology is an acknowledged finite and irreplaceable resource of unique cultural and social value.

The Plan designates four non-statutory Archaeologically Sensitive Areas (ASAs). These are Caerleon, The Levels, Lower Machen and the medieval town of Newport. This designation highlights their archaeological significance and informs potential developers of the need to seek professional archaeological advice to establish the archaeological constraints of the site. Proposed development within the ASA will require developers to submit credible archaeological impact assessment in support of their proposals.

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the ASA of the Wentlooge Levels that would have any such detrimental effects - WCC)

CE10 Coastal Zone

DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED IN THE COASTAL AREA OR ADJOINING THE TIDAL RIVER UNLESS:

i) IN THE UNDEVELOPED COASTAL AREA SUCH DEVELOPMENT IS REQUIRED TO BE ON THE COAST TO MEET AN EXCEPTIONAL NEED WHICH CANNOT REASONABLY BE ACCOMMODATED ELSEWHERE;

ii) THE AREA IS NOT ITSELF AT RISK NOR WILL THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT EXACERBATE RISKS FROM EROSION, FLOODING OR LAND INSTABILITY DEVELOPMENT WHICH REQUIRES A COASTAL LOCATION SHOULD BE SITED WITHIN THE DEVELOPED COASTAL ZONE.

The nature of the Gwent Levels is such that it enjoys a wide variety of protection through designation as Site of Special Scientific Interest, a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest, Archaeologically Sensitive Area, Special Landscape Area and part of it is included within the Green Belt. The Severn Estuary itself is a Wetland of International Importance (Ramsar Site), a Special Protection Area for birds, a Special Area of Conservation, and is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Flood risk and coastal erosion is a critical factor for the Severn Estuary. The Severn Estuary Coastal Group (SECG), of which the Council is a member, promotes sustainable shoreline management and facilitates organisations in managing coastal protection and flood resilience and management issues. The group has produced the Shoreline Management Plan review (SMP2)82 for the Severn Estuary which divides the shoreline into policy units outlining a policy option recommendation for each unit. These are: Hold the Line, No Active Intervention, Managed Realignment and Advance the Line. SMP2 proposes that coast defences within policy units to the south of the M4 (including the levels for Newport) reflect the policy option to Hold the Line and the defences to the North of the M4 to the Authority's boundary policy option is for No Active Intervention.

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the undeveloped coastal zone of the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

Summary

There are many reasons why Gypsy and Traveller accommodation should not be located in the Wentlooge Levels area but the four main reasons are that:-

- (a) There has to be exceptional circumstances to overcome the strong assumption against such inappropriate development in Green Belt/Green Wedge and open countryside;
- (b) The impact that any such proposals would have on the character and appearance of the Wentlooge Levels and the (Gwent Levels) Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest would not be acceptable;
- (c) The risk to life and property from flooding either to Gypsy/Travellers (which is particularly problematic where caravans/open fields are concerned) or to the 'settled' community, if not managed/mitigated, is unacceptable;
- (d) the implications of sewage treatment for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation would be seriously detrimental for the nature conservation interest of the designated Wentlooge Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

These and other themes have all been elucidated at length in the Decision Notice for 'Land to the East of Blue House Lane' – Appeal Ref: APP/G6935/C/10/2136691-2 by Mr R G Gardiner - an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers dated 13 May 2011.

The above Planning Inspector specifically remarked on the predominant character of the Gwent Levels landscape as being flat, open and vulnerable. He went on to say ... 'It is also one of recognised historic interest. It is included on Cadw's Register of Landscapes of Historic Interest in Wales the landscape characterisation study for which remarks on the landscape being of enormous importance and which retains a high degree of integrity and coherence. The open landscape is recognised as a strong feature, based largely on Roman land reclamation. It is made up of large exceptionally long narrow fields separated by drainage ditches (the reens) rather than hedges'.

Mr Gardiner emphasised that the assemblage of works, structures and caravans entailed in the (Gypsy and Traveller) use appear(ed) singularly out of place and intrusive in this setting.

Wentlooge Community Council believes that any other such Gypsy and Traveller accommodation would be as out of place and intrusive in the Wentlooge Levels and detrimental to the character and setting of this historic country landscape.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 357.K23 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: In order to develop this site extensive off-site mains for water would be required

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

It should be noted that there is no public water supply to the sites in this area. In order to develop this site extensive off-site mains for water would be required, which may be expensive for developers. Potential developers need to be aware that there is a 1650mm diameter strategic sewer that runs through the area.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1600.K2 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)007

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land near Peterstone Golf Club

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)007

This proposal is so vague and does not specify any specific land area. The whole area on the map is either green belt or green wedge and is on a flood plain and in an SSSI which definitions all make it unsuitable for the proposed use. This proposal should be rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3412.K2 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)007

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

3 3 Representation
None of these sites seem appropriate either because of access or location and 3 of the 4 sites would put additional pressure on already stretched services in Marshfield, particularly the school, shop, other amenities and roads.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K2 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Residential Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)007 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land near Peterstone Lake Golf Club |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed – Gypsy and Traveller Residential Accommodation Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area, Undeveloped Coastal Zone, part Green Wedge and part Green Belt. I do not support this as a gypsy and traveller residential site. Without an exact location, specific comment is difficult however the nature of this area would make it isolated from the necessary amenities such as grocery shops, pharmacy, dentist and post office. Public transport does not serve this location making this site wholly unsuitable as a gypsy and traveller residential site. The site is currently designated as Countryside Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive Green Wedge and undeveloped coastal zone which emphasises the unsuitability of this proposal. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. This site is also in close proximity to the sea wall and falls within the flood risk area. Notwithstanding the fact that the local primary school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed, the school does not offer the necessary provision for the needs of the children from gypsy and traveller communities. The road network to this site is unsuitable for both the additional volume and type of traffic associated with a gypsy and traveller site. I am also opposed to Newport Council allocating financial resource to purchase the site when budget spending is so tight and alternative Council owned land is available. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K18 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: No location plan provided

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)007 Land near to Peterstone Golf Club Peterstone
No location plan provided.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K2 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Comments regarding environmental/biodiversity constraints

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)007

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

3 3 Representation
(Map unclear) Within Gwent levels (Rumney and Peterstone) SSSI, close to Severn SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site.
Wales Coast Path, PROW, Bridleway, Special Landscape Area and development within open countryside.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K35 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Comments regarding SSSI status, flood risk and apparent absence of sustainability appraisal

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)007

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land near Peterstone Lake Golf Club

3 3 Representation

It does not seem that a Sustainability Appraisal has been supplied in support of this proposed allocation. Given the content of the Welsh Government's policy clarification letter CL-01-11 Local Development Plans - Sustainability appraisal procedure for alternative site representation, we therefore do not consider the proposed allocation complies with the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations.

Much of this area is notified as the Gwent Levels St. Brides SSSI and Gwent Levels – Rumney and Peterstone SSSI. There is a potential for direct or indirect adverse impacts from development on the SSSIs. Given the lack of detail provided by the proponent in relation to the location of the proposed alternative site, we are unable to provide further advice on any likely impact from any development in this area on the SSSI.

We would remind you of your authority's duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your' authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reasons of which the site is of special interest #

TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15). The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines +.

Contrary to ToS P2 & C2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | Yes | |
| <p># For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.</p> <p>We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.</p> <p>In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.</p> <p>+For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | No | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3692.K2 | Lawrence, Tracey | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)007 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land near Peterstone Lake Golf Club | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation This proposal within the register is not sound and valid because it does not meet all the criteria set out in the above Procedural, Consistency, Coherence and Effectiveness tests. The exact area of land is unknown therefore how can NCC and residents comment. The entire area is within SSI and on a floodplain therefore under WG report not suitable for proposed purpose. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K4 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Support for allocation of land as G&T site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land near Peterstone Lake Golf Course

3 3 Representation
I support inclusion of this site as good potential as a residential site.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why
All parts

As a resident directly affected I have valid questions & concerns to raise.

3849.K2 Suller, Cllr Tom

18/10/2013 E O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)007

This proposal is so vague and does not specify any specific land area. The whole area on the map is either green belt or green wedge and is on a flood plain and in an SSSI which definitions all make it unsuitable for the proposed use. This proposal should be rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3888.K8 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)007 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems. RAS(N)008 Former Depot RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner RAS(N)009 Former Speedway RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common RAS(N)051 Goldcliff | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3889.K8 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Support the suggested G&T site at Land Near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

3 3 Representation

I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives.

- RAS(N)008 Former Depot
- RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
- RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
- RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
- RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
- RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
- RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
- RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
- RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
- RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K9 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Support use of the Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club as Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Alternative site I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas.

RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club:- An area that already have travelers on a farm there.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3891.K8 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Support use of land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club as Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead.

RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3892.K8 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Land at Peterstone Lakes Golf Club is a more suitable G&T site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)007

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
 RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
 RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
 RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
 RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
 RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
 RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
 RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
 RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
 RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K11 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Support for allocation of land as a residential G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)007 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land near Peterstone Lake Golf Course | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation A site that has good potential as a Residential site. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4048.K2 | Birchall, Professor James | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)007

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land near Peterstone Lake Golf Club

3 3 Representation

The new sites proposed under part A as RAS(N)003, RAS(N)007, RAS(N)016 and RAS(N) 018 are clearly inappropriate. There is insufficient local resources (healthcare, education, retail) to accommodate gypsy traveller sites in this area. Situating such sites very close to fast-moving highways also represents a significant danger.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4121.K2 | Bancroft, Mr & Mrs T | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 507/ Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We strongly oppose this site being added as it is designated as Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area, Undeveloped Coastal Zone, part Green Wedge and part Green Belt. Also, the area itself is unsuited to a gypsy and traveller site as determined by the Welsh Government guidance. There are no local amenities in the area to provide for families, such as schools, medical services and shops. Public transport is limited / absent, and the road infrastructure itself is inadequate to accommodate heavy traffic.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Site,RepnType: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 47.K4 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Do not support the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Land close to Broadstreet Common

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)018 Land close to Broadstreet Common, Peterstone Proposed – Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area, Undeveloped Coastal Zone, part Green Wedge and part Green Belt. We can find no attributes to support the site identified as Land close to Broadstreet Common, Peterstone as a gypsy and traveller transit site. Without an exact location, specific comment is difficult however the nature of this area would make it isolated from the necessary amenities such as grocery shops, pharmacy, dentist and post office. The site is currently designated as Countryside Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive and most importantly a Green Wedge area. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. This site is also in close proximity to the sea wall and falls within the flood risk area. Notwithstanding the fact that the local primary school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed, the school does not offer the necessary provision for the needs of the children from gypsy and traveller communities. The road network to this site is unsuitable for both the additional volume and type of traffic associated with a gypsy and traveller site especially a transit site. We do not believe the land to be owned by Newport City Council, making any proposed development slow and expensive.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 55.K1 | Wentloog Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Land close to Broadstreet Common

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

Site Name – Land close to Broad Street Common RAS (N) 018

Wentlooge Community Council (WCC) finds it difficult to understand how Newport City Council (NCC) has included such vague proposals without any one specific site or group of sites being identified. This appears contrary to the Town and Country Planning Act (Wales) 2005 - Section 20 (c) (i) which clearly indicates that 'a' (or 'the') site should be identified and specifically that in 'address' should be given.

Wentlooge Community Council is therefore forced to address the issue of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation in broad terms across the whole of the map area albeit focussing 'near' Broad Street Common or 'close' to it as NCC interprets/describes it.

Wentlooge Community Council objects to Alternative Site proposals RAS(N) 018 – Land close ('near') to Broad Street Common for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation in its entirety for the following reasons:-

Introduction (WCC's past experience of Gypsy/Traveller sites on the Levels)

NCC has previously refused numerous (often retrospective) applications for such accommodation on adjoining land(s) following consents for change of use from 'Agricultural' to 'the keeping of horses, stable(s) and field shelter' or when Gypsies or Travellers have simply sited static caravan(s) on land without any previous permission(s) at all.

The majority of sites, especially those off Broad Street Common itself, do not have any infrastructure, being far out from the local settlement boundary: in many cases there are no mains services, water, gas, electricity or waste collection.

Many developments of this nature include the use of a cess pool (and often it's retrospective application for permission). The Community Council would always be anxious/object to such cess pools being located near to reens and would highlight the need to comply with Council regulations, as well as those of the Environment Agency and Countryside Council for Wales (now amalgamated as NRW), as the area is a SSSI.

There are also numerous trees within the area indicated and the Community Council is concerned that these are kept/maintained to help preserve/enhance the countryside.

UDP/LDP

This Alternative Site(s) proposal is contrary to many provisions of the Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 and the Revised Local Development Plan 2011 - 2026: The Alternative Site proposed is situated outside of the Peterstone Settlement boundary and is designated as 'open countryside' and green belt (SP5 and SP6).

The Alternative Site proposed/proposed development will be in many cases inappropriate in the countryside by reason of scale and appearance. Many clauses of the UDP/LDP are designed to protect the Wentlooge levels from such development that is not related to agriculture.

Specifically many of these Gypsy and Traveller developments include high gates, large expanses of hardcore and the timber panel fencing and are not in keeping with the area, especially the agricultural area of the levels. Developments in the past have been forced to remove high fencing (e.g. The Pigeon Loft) and/or gates and hardcore (e.g. Land to the east of Blue House Lane – Appeal Ref: APP/G6935/C/10/2136691-2).

The Alternative Site(s) proposed are also, in addition to being in open countryside and an undeveloped coastal zone, a Landscape of Historic Interest SLA (Register of Landscapes of Historic Interest in Wales), an Area of Special Archaeological interest ASA and adjacent to the major Ramsar site of the Wentlooge Levels / Severn Estuary.

The Wentlooge Levels are a unique area which need to be maintained effectively, as stated by it's inclusion in the Special Sites of Scientific Interest and designation as Green Belt.

Developments such as those suggested of Gypsy and Traveller sites could have a major impact on the ecological value on the reen systems. It would be reprehensible to see this unique landscape

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

with its particular agriculture and wildlife threatened, as well as assisting the merging of the cities of Cardiff and Newport through further reduction of the Green Belt.

Wentlooge Community Council would particularly bring Newport City Council's, and any future Planning Inspector's, attention to the policies and provisions of the Revised LDP 2011 - 2026 viz:-

Plan Objectives

Objective 1 – Sustainable Use of Land

To ensure that all development makes the most efficient use of natural resources by seeking to locate development in the most sustainable locations, minimise the impact on the environment and make a positive contribution to local communities.

A key way in which the Plan will seek to meet this objective is by focusing development on previously used, brownfield sites.

(i.e. not green field sites in the open countryside of the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

Objective 2 – Climate Change

To ensure that development and land uses in Newport make a positive contribution to minimising, adapting to or mitigating against the causes and impacts of climate change, by incorporating the principles of sustainable design, changes to travel behaviour, managing the risks and consequences of flooding, and improving efficiency in the use of energy, waste and water.

(i.e. not locating development in C1 floodplains such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

Objective 6 – Conservation of the Natural Environment

To protect and enhance the quality of the natural environment, including landscape, protected habitats and species of principal importance for biodiversity in Wales (regardless of greenfield or brownfield status) and the protection of controlled waters.

The Green Belt between Marshfield and Cardiff is the first area of statutory Green Belt in Wales. This was designated in the adopted Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996 – 2011 following earlier regional collaboration through SEWSPG on Green Belt issues around the capital. The Green Belt will continue to be protected throughout this Plan period, and will also be expanded slightly.

(i.e. not locating further development for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in Green Belt such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

Key elements of the Revised LDP's spatial strategy are to maximise the use of brownfield sites in the interests of sustainability, regeneration, community cohesion, and urban form; and to protect the landscape, including maintaining, and slightly extending, the statutory Green Belt on the Cardiff boundary; to conserve protected sites and species, and encourage biodiversity;

SP1 Sustainability

PROPOSALS WILL BE REQUIRED TO MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT BY CONCENTRATING DEVELOPMENT IN SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS ON BROWNFIELD LAND WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY.

The planning system is primarily concerned with the use of land so one of the key actions that can be taken to achieve sustainable development is to focus on reusing previously developed land, and making the best use of facilities and services, as opposed to developing on greenfield sites. As well as safeguarding countryside and other green areas, this will also tend to result in a more compact form of development, that can make use of existing physical and social infrastructure, and where public transport, walking and cycling are viable alternatives to the car.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

(i.e. specifically not developing Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in green field sites in open countryside such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP3 Flood Risk

NEWPORT'S COASTAL AND RIVERSIDE LOCATION NECESSITATES THAT DEVELOPMENT BE DIRECTED AWAY FROM AREAS WHERE FLOOD RISK IS IDENTIFIED AS A CONSTRAINT AND ENSURE THAT THE RISK OF FLOODING IS NOT INCREASED ELSEWHERE. DEVELOPMENT WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED IN FLOOD RISK AREAS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL GUIDANCE WHERE APPROPRIATE A DETAILED TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT WILL BE REQUIRED TO ENSURE THAT THE DEVELOPMENT IS DESIGNED TO COPE WITH THE THREAT AND CONSEQUENCES OF FLOODING OVER ITS LIFETIME. SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS TO MANAGE FLOOD RISK SHOULD BE PRIORITISED.

Flood risk management is a clear consideration for the LDP due to Newport's coastal location, the River Usk and the complex reen systems on the Gwent Levels. The tidal limit of the Usk extends beyond Newport's boundary making tidal and fluvial flood risk a key concern for a high proportion of the Authority area. In addition to tidal and fluvial flood risk developers must also consider their affect on surface, groundwater and flood risk from artificial sources, including reservoirs and canals. Watercourses within the Internal Drainage Board (IDB) area must not be culverted and development must avoid obstructing the water course by providing a buffer zone of 12.5m minimum for reens and 7m minimum for field ditches in order to allow ongoing maintenance. It is recommended that developers seek advice and information from the Natural Resources Wales, Local Authority and Internal Drainage Board where relevant.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in C1 floodplains and complex reen systems such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP5 Countryside

DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE (THAT IS, THAT AREA OF LAND LYING BEYOND THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES SHOWN ON THE PROPOSAL AND INSET MAPS) WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED WHERE THE USE IS APPROPRIATE IN THE COUNTRYSIDE. RESPECTS THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AND BIODIVERSITY OF THE IMMEDIATE AND SURROUNDING AREA AND IS APPROPRIATE IN SCALE AND DESIGN. HOUSING DEVELOPMENT, RURAL DIVERSIFICATION AND RURAL ENTERPRISE USES, BEYOND SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES, WILL ONLY BE APPROPRIATE WHERE THEY COMPLY WITH NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY.

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.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in green field sites in open countryside such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP6 Green Belt

THE GREEN BELT IS MAINTAINED ALONG THE NEWPORT – CARDIFF BOUNDARY AND EXTENDED NORTHWARDS TO THE M4 MOTORWAY. WITHIN THIS AREA DEVELOPMENT WHICH PREJUDICES THE OPEN NATURE OF THE LAND WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.

The green belt that lies between Marshfield and Cardiff was designated, following regional discussions, by the Newport Unitary Development Plan 1996 – 2011 as the first green belt in Wales. Green belts are normally expected to have a life beyond that of one development Plan, so the existing green belt is maintained and a small addition made to extend it northwards to the M4 motorway to provide a more logical and distinct boundary. The extension is also considered necessary to respond to development within the Local Authority area, and pressure for development within the neighbouring Local Authority of Cardiff nearest the Newport boundary.

The Newport – Cardiff gap, being only about 3 miles wide in places, and sitting between two of the only five cities of Wales, is crucial to the maintenance of urban form. There is no appetite for the cities to merge, and indeed much public support for the maintenance of this gap and the separate identity of the cities.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in Green Belt such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

SP7 Green Wedges

GREEN WEDGES HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED IN ORDER TO PREVENT COALESCENCE BETWEEN THE FOLLOWING SETTLEMENTS: NEWPORT AND CARDIFF - WITHIN THESE AREAS DEVELOPMENT WHICH PREJUDICES THE OPEN NATURE OF THE LAND WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.

Green Wedges have been designated on a common basis with the other local planning authorities in South Wales. The prime purpose of Green Wedges is to prevent coalescence between urban areas. The designation is not made necessarily on the basis of the physical quality of the landscape, but rather to maintain their openness. The areas designated tend to have significant importance for their openness and for their role in maintaining the distinct identify of separate communities.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in Green Wedges such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP8 Special Landscape Areas

SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS ARE DESIGNATED AS FOLLOWS WITHIN WHICH PROPOSALS WILL BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE POSITIVELY TO THE AREA THROUGH HIGH QUALITY DESIGN, MATERIALS AND MANAGEMENT SCHEMES THAT DEMONSTRATE A CLEAR APPRECIATION OF THE AREA'S SPECIAL FEATURES: WENTLOOGE LEVELS

Within Special Landscape Areas, priority will be given to landscape conservation and enhancement. The designation of a SLA does not preclude development but any proposals must demonstrate that they have been designed to respect the valued characteristics of the recognised landscape as well as being in accordance with other Policies of this Plan.

(i.e. not locating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in SLAs such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

SP9 Conservation of the Natural, Historic and Built Environment

THE CONSERVATION, ENHANCEMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF RECOGNISED SITES WITHIN THE NATURAL, HISTORIC AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT WILL BE SOUGHT IN ALL PROPOSALS.

(i.e. discouraging development in the natural environment of the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

General Development Principles

GP1 General Development Principles – Climate Change

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD:

BE DESIGNED TO WITHSTAND THE PREDICTED CHANGES IN THE LOCAL CLIMATE AND TO REDUCE THE RISK OF FLOODING ON SITE AND ELSEWHERE, UNLESS THE RISK AND CONSEQUENCES OF FLOODING ARE DEMONSTRATED AS BEING ACCEPTABLY MANAGED, INCLUDING THE AVOIDANCE OF NON-PERMEABLE HARD SURFACES;

Development proposals may not only be at risk of flooding themselves, but may also exacerbate existing or create new flooding problems on other land or property through reductions in floodplain storage capacity or by impeding flood flows.

(i.e. discouraging development in C1 floodplains and complex reen systems such as the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

GP2 General Development Principles – General Amenity

DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE, AS APPLICABLE:

i) THERE WILL NOT BE A SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECT ON LOCAL AMENITY, INCLUDING IN TERMS OF NOISE, DISTURBANCE, PRIVACY, OVERBEARING, LIGHT, ODOURS AND AIR

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

QUALITY;

ii) THE PROPOSED USE AND FORM OF DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE VISUAL AMENITIES OF NEARBY OCCUPIERS OR THE CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE OF THE SURROUNDING AREA;

iii) THE PROPOSAL SEEKS TO DESIGN OUT THE OPPORTUNITY FOR CRIME AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR;

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the Wentlooge Levels that would have such detrimental effects - the known results of the impact of Gypsy and Traveller Sites in the past - WCC)

GP5 General Development Principles – Natural Environment

DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE, AS APPLICABLE:

i) THE PROPOSALS ARE DESIGNED AND MANAGED TO PROTECT AND ENCOURAGE BIODIVERSITY AND ECOLOGICAL CONNECTIVITY, INCLUDING THROUGH THE INCORPORATION OF NEW FEATURES ON OR OFF SITE TO FURTHER THE UK, WELSH AND/OR NEWPORT BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLANS;

ii) THE PROPOSALS DEMONSTRATE HOW THEY AVOID, OR MITIGATE AND COMPENSATE NEGATIVE IMPACTS TO BIODIVERSITY, ENSURING THAT THERE ARE NO SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS ON AREAS OF NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST INCLUDING INTERNATIONAL, EUROPEAN, NATIONAL, WELSH SECTION 4239 AND LOCAL PROTECTED HABITATS AND SPECIES, AND PROTECTING FEATURES OF IMPORTANCE FOR ECOLOGY;

iii) THE PROPOSAL WILL NOT RESULT IN AN UNACCEPTABLE IMPACT ON WATER QUALITY;

iv) THE PROPOSAL SHOULD NOT RESULT IN THE LOSS OR REDUCTION IN QUALITY OF HIGH QUALITY AGRICULTURAL LAND (GRADES 1, 2 AND 3A);

v) THERE WOULD BE NO UNACCEPTABLE IMPACT ON LANDSCAPE QUALITY;

vi) THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES AN APPROPRIATE LANDSCAPE SCHEME, WHICH ENHANCES THE SITE AND THE WIDER CONTEXT INCLUDING GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND BIODIVERSITY NETWORKS;

vii) THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES APPROPRIATE TREE PLANTING OR RETENTION WHERE APPROPRIATE AND DOES NOT RESULT IN THE UNACCEPTABLE LOSS OF OR HARM TO TREES, WOODLAND OR HEDGEROWS THAT HAVE WILDLIFE OR AMENITY VALUE.

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the Wentlooge Levels that would have such detrimental effects - the known results of the impact of Gypsy and Traveller Sites in the past - WCC)

CE1 Development in the Green Belt and Green Wedges

IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE OPEN CHARACTER OF THE GREEN BELT AND GREEN WEDGES, DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED FOR:

i) AGRICULTURAL OR FORESTRY USES;

ii) ESSENTIAL FACILITIES FOR OUTDOOR SPORT AND OUTDOOR RECREATION;

iii) LIMITED EXTENSION, ALTERATION OR REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING DWELLINGS WITHIN THEIR EXISTING CURTILAGE;

iv) OTHER USES OF LAND WHICH MAINTAIN THE OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT AND WHICH DO NOT CONFLICT WITH THE PURPOSE OF INCLUDING LAND WITHIN IT; PROPOSALS SHOULD NOT PREJUDICE THE PURPOSES OF THE GREEN BELT/GREEN WEDGE BY REASON OF THEIR SCALE, SITING, MATERIALS OR DESIGN. VISUAL AMENITIES OF

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

THE GREEN BELT/GREEN WEDGE SHOULD NOT BE HARMED BY PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN OR CONSPICUOUS FROM THEM.

The most important attribute of the Green Belt/Green Wedges is their openness, and development within them will be strictly controlled. Development of an urban nature will not therefore be appropriate or any other form of development that would erode the essential openness of the land.

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the Wentlooge Levels that would have any such detrimental effects - WCC)

CE5 Historic Landscapes, Parks, Gardens and Battlefields

SITES INCLUDED IN THE REGISTER OF LANDSCAPES, PARKS AND GARDENS OF SPECIAL HISTORIC INTEREST AND HISTORIC BATTLEFIELDS SHOULD BE PROTECTED, CONSERVED, ENHANCED AND WHERE APPROPRIATE, RESTORED. ATTENTION WILL ALSO BE GIVEN TO THEIR SETTING

The Register of Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales identifies the Gwent Levels as an area which is uniquely rich in archaeological and historical resource. The Register does not preclude development but as advised in Welsh Office Circular 61/96, it should be used in determining planning applications where the development is of a sufficient scale to have more than a local impact on the historic landscape. Such developments may require an Environmental Impact Assessment. Therefore an Assessment of the Significance of the Impact of Development on Historic Landscape (ASIDOHL2) will be required and the outcomes implemented for those developments deemed to have more than a local impact on the historic landscape.

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the SLA of the Wentlooge Levels that would have any such detrimental effects - WCC)

CE7 Archaeology

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL NORMALLY BE REQUIRED TO UNDERTAKE AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT BEFORE THE PROPOSAL IS DETERMINED:

i) WHERE GROUNDWORKS AND/OR THE INSTALLATION OF SERVICES ARE PROPOSED WITHIN THE ARCHAEOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE AREAS OF CAERLEON, THE LEVELS, LOWER MACHEN AND THE CITY CENTRE , OR;

ii) WITHIN OTHER AREAS OF RECOGNISED ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST.

Welsh Office Circulars 60/9668 and 61/9669 place an onus on developers to consider the impact of their proposals on archaeology. Archaeology is an acknowledged finite and irreplaceable resource of unique cultural and social value.

The Plan designates four non-statutory Archaeologically Sensitive Areas (ASAs). These are Caerleon, The Levels, Lower Machen and the medieval town of Newport. This designation highlights their archaeological significance and informs potential developers of the need to seek professional archaeological advice to establish the archaeological constraints of the site. Proposed development within the ASA will require developers to submit credible archaeological impact assessment in support of their proposals.

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the ASA of the Wentlooge Levels that would have any such detrimental effects - WCC)

CE10 Coastal Zone

DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED IN THE COASTAL AREA OR ADJOINING THE TIDAL RIVER UNLESS:

i) IN THE UNDEVELOPED COASTAL AREA SUCH DEVELOPMENT IS REQUIRED TO BE ON THE COAST TO MEET AN EXCEPTIONAL NEED WHICH CANNOT REASONABLY BE ACCOMMODATED ELSEWHERE;

ii) THE AREA IS NOT ITSELF AT RISK NOR WILL THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT EXACERBATE RISKS FROM EROSION, FLOODING OR LAND INSTABILITY DEVELOPMENT WHICH

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

REQUIRES A COASTAL LOCATION SHOULD BE SITED WITHIN THE DEVELOPED COASTAL ZONE.

The nature of the Gwent Levels is such that it enjoys a wide variety of protection through designation as Site of Special Scientific Interest, a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest, Archaeologically Sensitive Area, Special Landscape Area and part of it is included within the Green Belt. The Severn Estuary itself is a Wetland of International Importance (Ramsar Site), a Special Protection Area for birds, a Special Area of Conservation, and is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

Flood risk and coastal erosion is a critical factor for the Severn Estuary. The Severn Estuary Coastal Group (SECG), of which the Council is a member, promotes sustainable shoreline management and facilitates organisations in managing coastal protection and flood resilience and management issues. The group has produced the Shoreline Management Plan review (SMP2)82 for the Severn Estuary which divides the shoreline into policy units outlining a policy option recommendation for each unit. These are: Hold the Line, No Active Intervention, Managed Realignment and Advance the Line. SMP2 proposes that coast defences within policy units to the south of the M4 (including the levels for Newport) reflect the policy option to Hold the Line and the defences to the North of the M4 to the Authority's boundary policy option is for No Active Intervention.

(i.e. discouraging all such developments in the undeveloped coastal zone of the Wentlooge Levels - WCC)

Summary

There are many reasons why Gypsy and Traveller accommodation should not be located in the Wentlooge Levels area but the four main reasons are that:-

- (a) There has to be exceptional circumstances to overcome the strong assumption against such inappropriate development in Green Belt/Green Wedge and open countryside;
- (b) The impact that any such proposals would have on the character and appearance of the Wentlooge Levels and the (Gwent Levels) Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest would not be acceptable;
- (c) The risk to life and property from flooding either to Gypsy/Travellers (which is particularly problematic where caravans/open fields are concerned) or to the 'settled' community, if not managed/mitigated, is unacceptable;
- (d) the implications of sewage treatment for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation would be seriously detrimental for the nature conservation interest of the designated Wentlooge Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

These and other themes have all been elucidated at length in the Decision Notice for 'Land to the East of Blue House Lane' – Appeal Ref: APP/G6935/C/10/2136691-2 by Mr R G Gardiner - an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers dated 13 May 2011.

The above Planning Inspector specifically remarked on the predominant character of the Gwent Levels landscape as being flat, open and vulnerable. He went on to say ... 'It is also one of recognised historic interest. It is included on Cadw's Register of Landscapes of Historic Interest in Wales the landscape characterisation study for which remarks on the landscape being of enormous importance and which retains a high degree of integrity and coherence. The open landscape is recognised as a strong feature, based largely on Roman land reclamation. It is made up of large exceptionally long narrow fields separated by drainage ditches (the reens) rather than hedges'.

Mr Gardiner emphasised that the assemblage of works, structures and caravans entailed in the (Gypsy and Traveller) use appear(ed) singularly out of place and intrusive in this setting.

Wentlooge Community Council believes that any other such Gypsy and Traveller accommodation would be as out of place and intrusive in the Wentlooge Levels and detrimental to the character and setting of this historic country landscape.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 357.K24 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: In order to develop this site extensive off-site mains for water would be required.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

It should be noted that there is no public water supply to the sites in this area. In order to develop this site extensive off-site mains for water would be required, which may be expensive for developers. Potential developers need to be aware that there is a 1650mm diameter strategic sewer that runs through the area.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1600.K4 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land close to Broad Street Common

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)018

This proposal is entirely in the green belt, on a flood plain and in an area of scientific and historical interest. No specific area of land is designated. The proposal should be rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3412.K4 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land close to Broadstreet Common

3 3 Representation
None of these sites seem appropriate either because of access or location and 3 of the 4 sites would put additional pressure on already stretched services in Marshfield, particularly the school, shop, other amenities and roads.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K4 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)018 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land close to Broadstreet Common, Peterstone |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed – Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area, Undeveloped Coastal Zone, part Green Wedge and part Green Belt. I am opposed to this addition as a gypsy and traveller transit site. Without an exact location, specific comment is difficult however the nature of this area would make it isolated from the necessary amenities such as grocery shops, pharmacy, dentist and post office. The site is currently designated as Countryside Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive and most importantly a Green Wedge area. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. This site is also in close proximity to the sea wall and falls within the flood risk area. Notwithstanding the fact that the local primary school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed, the school does not offer the necessary provision for the needs of the children from gypsy and traveller communities. The road network to this site is unsuitable for both the additional volume and type of traffic associated with a gypsy and traveller site especially a transit site. I am also opposed to Newport Council allocating financial resource to purchase the site when budget spending is so tight and alternative Council owned land is available. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3663.K19 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: No location plan provided

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)018 Land Close to Broad Street Common
No location plan provided

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K9 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Comments on proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Land close to Broadstreet Common

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
(Map unclear) Within Gwent Levels (Rumney and Peterstone) SSSI, close to Severn SAC, SSSI, SPA, Ramsar site. Access issues include Wales Coast Path, PROW, Bridleway, Special Landscape Area and development within open countryside. TPO potential.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K36 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Comments regarding SSSI status, particular vulnerability of G&T/caravan sites to flooding and apparent absence of sustainability appraisal

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land close to Broadstreet Common, Peterstone

3 3 Representation

It does not seem that a Sustainability Appraisal has been supplied in support of this proposed allocation. Given the content of the Welsh Government's policy clarification letter CL-01-11 Local Development Plans - Sustainability appraisal procedure for alternative site representation, we therefore do not consider the proposed allocation complies with the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations.

Much of this area is notified as the Gwent Levels – Rumney and Peterstone SSSI. There is a potential for direct or indirect adverse impacts from development on the SSSIs. Given the lack of detail provided by the proponent in relation to the location of the proposed alternative site, we are unable to provide further advice on any likely impact from any development in this area on the SSSI.

We would remind you of your authority's duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reasons of which the site is of special interest #

TAN15 states at paragraph 11.22 that 'caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding.' We refer you to the remainder of this paragraph in TAN15 for further guidance. These sites would be considered highly vulnerable from a flood risk perspective (see section 5.1 of TAN15). The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines +

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | | |
| <p># For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.</p> <p>We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.</p> <p>In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.</p> <p>+For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | | |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3692.K4 | Lawrence, Tracey | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)018 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land close to Broad Street Common, Peterstone | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation This proposal within the register is not sound and valid because it does not meet all the criteria set out in the above Procedural, Consistency, Coherence and Effectiveness test. The exact area of land is unknown therefore how can NCC and residents comment. The entire area is within Ssi and on a floodplain therefore under WG report not suitable for proposed purpose. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | Yes |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3737.K3 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Support for allocation of land as G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)018 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land close to Broadstreet Common | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support inclusion of this site it has good potential as a residential site | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts As a resident directly affected I have valid questions & concerns to raise. | |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3849.K4 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Land close to Broadstreet Common

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)018

This proposal is entirely in the green belt, on a flood plain and in an area of scientific and historical interest. No specific area of land is designated. The proposal should be rejected.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3888.K9 | Edmunds, Mr J L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Land close to Broad Street Common would make a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land close to Broad Street Common.

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot

RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows

RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks

RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner

RAS(N)009 Former Speedway

RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road

RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate

RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club

RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common

RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3889.K9 | French, Terry | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Support the suggested G&T site at Land close to Broadstreet Common.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land close to Broad Street Common

3 3 Representation

I have suffered enough anti social problems as a result of my home being right next to the underpass to Cott Hill where it is planned to accommodate gypsy/travelers that I suggest the following sites as far more sensible alternatives.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3890.K10 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Support land close to Broadstreet Common as Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Alternative site I consider to be remote enough from large densely populated areas.

RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
Another suitable site for residential use.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3891.K9 | French, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Support land close to Broadstreet Common as Gypsy and Traveller site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As I do not want the risk of trouble as a result of a travelers site so close to a school and large housing estate I request that the following sites be used instead.

RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3892.K9 | Edmunds, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|---------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Land at Broadstreet Common is a more suitable G&T site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land Close to Broad Street Common.

3 3 Representation

The sites listed below would be more suitable for housing travelers and less likely to cause any large scale anti racial problems.

RAS(N)008 Former Depot
 RAS(N)001 Queens Way Meadows
 RAS(N)004 Former Army Barracks
 RAS(N)005 Former Army Camp Pye Corner
 RAS(N)009 Former Speedway
 RAS(N)047 Land at Tatton Road
 RAS(N)059 Land within/adjacent to Leeway Industrial Estate
 RAS(N)007 Land near Peterstone Lakes Golf Club
 RAS(N)018 Land close to Broad Street Common
 RAS(N)051 Goldcliff

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3982.K12 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Support for allocation of land as a residential G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)018 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land Close to Broadstreet Common | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation A site that has good potential as a Residential site. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4048.K4 | Birchall, Professor James | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land near Broadstreet Common

3 3 Representation

The new sites proposed under part A as RAS(N)003, RAS(N)007, RAS(N)016 and RAS(N) 018 are clearly inappropriate. There is insufficient local resources (healthcare, education, retail) to accommodate gypsy traveller sites in this area. Situating such sites very close to fast-moving highways also represents a significant danger.

4121.K4 Bancroft, Mr & Mrs T

18/10/2013 W O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Land close to Broadstreet Common

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We strongly oppose this site being added as it is designated as Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area, Undeveloped Coastal Zone, part Green Wedge and part Green Belt. Also, the area itself is unsuited to a gypsy and traveller site as determined by the Welsh Government guidance. There are no local amenities in the area to provide for families, such as schools, medical services and shops. Public transport is limited / absent, and the road infrastructure itself is inadequate to accommodate heavy traffic.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4126.K1 | Campbell, M A & F S | | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Supports the suggested site at Broadstreet Common, Peterstone.

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)018 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land close to Broadstreet Common, Peterstone. | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We think that this would be the most suitable location for a travellers site. Reasons: Low residential density. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4230.K1 | Hale, Mr Paul | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 508/ Land close to Broadstreet Common

Summary: Support for site in Peterstone

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

- 1 The proposed site may be rural but is NOT remote . Within 100 yards are large commercial companies , and a thriving G and T community
- 2 The complete area of Peterstone Wentloog is in a "flood plain" New houses ARE in this area. As are newly extended G and T sites . You only have to drive there to see the proliferation of these new G and T sites .
- 3 A precedent has been set by the Environment agency . No objection was raised to new sites being established in Cardiff , therefore none can be sustained by establishing new ones some 200m yards away
- 4 The seawall has been constructed to prevent " flood" which I understood to be a 1 in 1000 year risk ?
- 5 It is therefore plain that the "strict" Welsh Government rules have not applied to Cardiff , so it begs the question that Newport (the poor relation in WG eyes?) should not be penalised , and a flat playing field should be the rule
- 6 Finally , the A 48 is barely more than a mile away .

I still firmly believe this should become the site of choice for Newport. Everything is in its favour .

Site,RepnType: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 47.K5 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane

Summary: Do not support purely residential development but would welcome community development to meet the current shortage of facilities.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)020 Ty Mawr Lane, Marshfield Proposed – Residential Development or Community Related Uses Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area and Green Wedge. In principle we would object to such a proposed development in Marshfield as a residential site for the following reasons: The site is currently designated as Countryside Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive and most importantly a Green Wedge area, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. We do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. This site is also very close to the sea wall and should tidal flooding ever occur would almost certainly be affected. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This would also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a further residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation. There are precious few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial. There is a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily. In principle we would welcome any developments in Marshfield that are genuinely for Community purposes as there is a definite shortage of such areas within our village.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1600.K5 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|---------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)020

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Ty Mawr Lane

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)020

This site is outside the village boundary and on a flood plain. It is not served by mains sewers and highway access is poor. It is not a natural extension of the built environment and should be rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3206.K1 | Harris, Mr & Mrs J | Derek Prosser Associates | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane

Summary: Objection to the inclusion of the site

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

We wish to highlight the sound planning reasons why this site should not be considered for inclusion as an additional housing site.

The site is located at the edge of the village where strong rural qualities are prevalent. Ty-Mawr Lane is particularly rural in character with the Dresnewydd Reen, fronting the site and the length of the road, dominating. The modest number of houses offered by the development of the site would not compensate for the loss of character to this rural edge. Additionally, the road improvements necessary to accommodate the development would be harmful and the junction with Marshfield road inadequate to cope with the additional traffic generated.

While it is suggested that further residential development is necessary in the Plan period to address a short term deficiency of land generally and Marshfield is a village with services and facilities where there is high demand for new housing, the site RAS(N)050 is a more sustainable and appropriate site. It is better related to the village form, to services and facilities in the village, including bus services, and is a more logical extension in relation to the recent Cambrian Drive development and the soon to be developed housing site at Groes Farm, which is included in the site identified. This latter development is immediately alongside the Marshfield Road frontage and provides junction improvements which will accommodate the development of the larger site RAS(N)050.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3412.K5 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)020 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Ty Mawr Lane, Marshfield |
| 3 | 3 | Representation 1. All of these sites are designated either Countryside, Special landscape area, Archaeologically sensitive area or Green wedge and ought not be used for development when there are undeveloped brownfield sites within the LDP area. 2. Marshfield school is already oversubscribed and cannot take more children without significant expansion. 3. Traffic in Marshfield is already congested and school start/finish times make Marshfield Road a nightmare. 4. Drainage in Marshfield is at capacity and cannot support additional dwellings. 5. Local amenities do not support the existing population never mind a larger one. 6. Public Transport links are poor. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K5 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)020

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Ty Mawr Lane, Marshfield

3 3 Representation
Proposed – Residential Development or Community Related Uses

Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area and Green Wedge.

Opposed.

The site is currently designated as Countryside Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive and most importantly a Green Wedge area, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. We do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge.

This site is also very close to the sea wall and should tidal flooding ever occur would almost certainly be affected.

The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This would also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity.

The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a further residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation.

There are precious few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial. There is a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha.

There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K37 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane

Summary: Objection to the proposed allocation of land for residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)020

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Ty Mawr Lane

3 3 Representation

Proposed residential use within SSSI and in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Green Wedge/Open Countryside (Greenfield) site*

This proposed alternative site is within the Gwent Levels – Rummey and Peterstone SSSI and has the potential to cause loss and/or degradation of the special interest. It also has potential adverse implications for the management of the SSSI. We would therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest #

In addition, it is likely that there are habitats and species of principle importance for biodiversity in Wales at the site that are included on the Section 42 List of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act. We remind you of your authority's duty under section 40 of the NERC Act, to have regard to conserving biodiversity. Adverse effects on Section 42 interests should therefore be taken into consideration should you consider allocating the site in the LDP.

This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and the allocation of Special Landscape Areas set out in the LDP and undermines the allocation of the area as a Green Wedge, the aim of which is to retain the openness of the area.

The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability tidal flood outlines of the Severn Estuary +

Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2

(See additional information and hyperlink)

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3849.K5 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

18/10/2013



E

O

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Ty Mawr Lane

| Item Question | Representation Text |
|---------------|---------------------|
|---------------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

RAS(N)020

This site is outside the village boundary and on a flood plain. It is not served by mains sewers and highway access is poor. It is not a natural extension of the built environment and should be rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4111.K1 | Callaghan, Diana | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Ty Mawr

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I wish to object to the plans submitted for Ty Mawr Lane, Marshfield.

This site is totally unsuitable for development because it is valuable agricultural land and represents important green belt area between Marshfield and Coedkernew.

The access is very difficult as the lane is single track and unlit.

It would also extend unnecessarily the village boundaries that have remained unchanged for many years.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4121.K5 | Bancroft, Mr & Mrs T | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 509/ Ty Mawr Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Ty Mawr, Marshfield

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We would oppose further development within Marshfield, especially green field sites. The village is already at capacity from many perspectives, as outlined by Marshfield Community Council: The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This would also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a further residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily. There is a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha. There are precious few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial for the village.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 510/ Land at Blacktown,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 47.K6 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 510/ Land at Blacktown

Summary: Object to proposed development at Blacktown

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)028 Land at Blacktown, Marshfield Proposed – Residential Development Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area and Green Belt. In principle we would object to such a proposed development in Marshfield as a residential site for the following reasons: The site is currently designated as Countryside Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive and most importantly a Green Belt area, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. We do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. This site is very large, almost as large as 2 existing estates (Mallards Reach & Meadows combined) and if developed for residential purposes would conceivably add 200 or more houses in an already overcrowded village. This could take a village of approximately 1500 people to 2300 (allowing for 4 people per house). A development of this size would cause a massive change in the dynamics of the village and would entail many areas requiring improvement and investment. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting such a large amount of new residential dwellings in the catchment would add massive strain on the resources. It could potentially require the school to be increased by 30% and. This would also in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which is near capacity. This would add strain on the local sports and playground facilities in the area, which are already inadequate for the number of residents. There is a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha. The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a new large residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation. There are precious few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

357.K7 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water

18/10/2013

E

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 510/ Land at Blacktown

Summary: No problems are envisaged at receiving WwTW as a result of proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site. Our records indicate that there have been incidents of external flooding to properties downstream of the development site. A scheme to resolve flooding issues and mitigate against recurrences of flooding incidents in this area has been factored into our current Capital Investment Programme.

Furthermore, this is one of many development proposals in your Alternative Sites consultation that will drain to our Marshfield Sewage Pumping Station. The cumulative effect of these developments will require an assessment of Marshfield SPS, to establish what improvements are required.

No problems are envisaged at the receiving Cardiff Bay Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1600.K6 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 510/ Land at Blacktown

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)028 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Blacktown |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)028 |
|---|---|-----------------------------|

This site is in the green belt and does not support the policy of preserving the open countryside between Cardiff and Newport. It will also put pressure on the local infrastructure as detailed below (see rep 1600.K7 for comments relating to infrastructure) and should be rejected for the reasons given in the previous assessment (ref 2061.C1)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3206.K3 | Harris, Mr & Mrs J | Derek Prosser Associates | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 510/ Land at Blacktown

Summary: Objection to site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

We wish to highlight the sound planning reasons why this site should not be considered for inclusion as an additional housing site.

While the site might appear to fall within the midst of the settlement of Marshfield, the land falls within the Green Belt and there is no over riding need or planning reason to justify the loss of this area of the Green Belt. There is a presumption against development in a Green Belt which is important for its openness and permanence.

The scale and location of this suggested site is unwarranted and would be prejudicial to the form and character of the village. This is particularly the case when more modest proposals such as that identified as site RAS(N)050 have been put forward in an effort to address a general short term deficiency of land, in a more sustainable position in the village of Marshfield where there is a high demand for new housing.

The Alternative Site off Church Lane is better related to the form of the village, to services and facilities in the village, including bus services, and is a more logical extension in relation to the recent Cambrian Drive development and the soon to be development housing site at Groes Farm, which is included in the site identified. This latter development is immediately alongside at the Marshfield road frontage and provides junction improvements which will accommodate the development of the larger site RAS(N)050.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3412.K6 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 510/ Land at Blacktown

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)028 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Blacktown |
| 3 | 3 | Representation 1. All of these sites are designated either Countryside, Special landscape area, Archaeologically sensitive area or Green wedge and ought not be used for development when there are undeveloped brownfield sites within the LDP area. 2. Marshfield school is already oversubscribed and cannot take more children without significant expansion. 3. Traffic in Marshfield is already congested and school start/finish times make Marshfield Road a nightmare. 4. Drainage in Marshfield is at capacity and cannot support additional dwellings. 5. Local amenities do not support the existing population never mind a larger one. 6. Public Transport links are poor. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K6 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 510/ Land at Blacktown

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)028

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Blacktown, Marshfield

3 3 Representation
Proposed – Residential Development

Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeological Sensitive Area and Green Belt.

Opposed.

The site is currently designated as Countryside Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive and most importantly a Green Belt area, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. We do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge.

This site is very large, almost as large as 2 existing estates (Mallards Reach & Meadows combined) and if developed for residential purposes would conceivably add 200 or more houses in an already overcrowded village. This could take a village of approximately 1500 people to 2300 (allowing for 4 people per house). A development of this size would cause a massive change in the dynamics of the village and would entail many areas requiring improvement and investment.

The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting such a large amount of new residential dwellings in the catchment would add massive strain on the resources. It could potentially require the school to be increased by 30% and. This would also in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which is near capacity.

This would add strain on the local sports and playground facilities in the area, which are already inadequate for the number of residents. There is a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha.

The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a new large residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation.

There are precious few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial.

There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3673.K11 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 510/ Land at Blacktown

Summary: Comments on proposed residential development at Land at Blacktown, Marshfield

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Outside SSSI. Semi-improved grassland. Limited connectivity. PROW link across site. TPO potential.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K38 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 510/ Land at Blacktown

Summary: Objection to proposed extension of village boundary for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)028 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Blacktown, Marshfield |
| 3 | 3 | Representation The proposal would extend the village into an area which has been identified as a Green Belt and Special Landscape Area in the evidence led LDP. As the purposes of green belts are to retain the openness of the area, residential development at this site would be inconsistent with those aims or the strategy of the LDP. The site is located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability tidal flood outlines of the Severn Estuary + Contrary to ToS C2 and CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material +For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3849.K6 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 510/ Land at Blacktown

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Blacktown, Marshfield

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)028

This site is in the green belt and does not support the policy of preserving the open countryside between Cardiff and Newport. It will also put pressure on the local infrastructure as detailed below and should be rejected for the reasons given in the previous assessment (ref 2061.C1)

Site,RepnType: 511/ Former Poultry Plant,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 47.K7 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 511/ Former Poultry Plant

Summary: Concerns raised over the development of site access, traffic levels and placing a strain on facilities.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)033 Former Poultry Plant, Castleton Proposed – Residential Development Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area and Green Wedge. The site is designated as Green Wedge, Special Landscape and Open Countryside, and the residential development of Brownfield sites within the Local Development Plan would be more suitable. However, we recognise that the proposed residential development of this site would have significantly less impact to local residents than when the site was operational as a poultry plant, or if the site were to be reinstated for industrial/commercial use. However, whilst we are not wholly opposed to residential development on this site, we do have the following concerns: Access to the site is via a privately owned road. This road already has 5 dwellings off it, plus rear access to a 6th property. The design guide for infill properties specifies private driveways should only have access to 5 dwellings, and should be of an adoptable standard. Traffic on Marshfield Road is already a big concern, particularly around school pick up and drop off times, and further traffic would impact on child and parent safety, especially with the newly located playgroup, Marshfield Monkeys, situated at the entrance to the site. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment, without investment in expanding school facilities, would add further strain on the resources. This would also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. There are precious few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. There is also a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K8 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 511/ Former Poultry Plant

Summary: No problems are envisaged at the receiving WwTW as a result of proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site, but this will require the provision of off-site mains to be laid to the boundary of the site. These can be provided by a water requisition scheme, under Sections 41 – 44 of the Water Industry Act 1991. No problems are envisaged with the public sewerage system for domestic foul discharge or at the receiving Cardiff Bay Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic flows from the proposed site.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3412.K7 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 511/ Former Poultry Plant

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)033

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Former Poultry Plant

3 3 Representation

1. All of these sites are designated either Countryside, Special landscape area, Archaeologically sensitive area or Green wedge and ought not be used for development when there are undeveloped brownfield sites within the LDP area.
2. Marshfield school is already oversubscribed and cannot take more children without significant expansion.
3. Traffic in Marshfield is already congested and school start/finish times make Marshfield Road a nightmare.
4. Drainage in Marshfield is at capacity and cannot support additional dwellings.
5. Local amenities do not support the existing population never mind a larger one.
6. Public Transport links are poor.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K7 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 511/ Former Poultry Plant

Summary: Supports proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)033

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Poultry Plant, Castleton

3 3 Representation
Proposed – Residential Development

Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area and Green Wedge.

Supported.

The proposed residential development of this site would have significantly less impact to local residents than when the site was operational as a poultry plant, or if the site were to be reinstated for industrial/commercial use.

However, whilst not opposed to residential development on this site, I am concerned about the restricted access to the site down a private road, the additional traffic on Marshfield Road particularly at peak school times when the site entrance is in very close proximity to the school and playgroups.

If developed, I would also like to see a financial contribution to Marshfield Primary and Bassaleg for expansion, in recognition that both schools are near capacity (and in some years over subscribed) and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment, without investment in expanding school facilities, would add further strain on the resources.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K15 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 511/ Former Poultry Plant

Summary: Comments on proposed residential development at Former Poultry Plant, Castleton

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Brownfield site, adjacent to ree would feed into SSSI. Development in open countryside. PROW.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

Site,RepnType: 512/ Gelli Bach,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| 47.K8 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | W | | M | |
|--------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 512/ Gelli Bach

Summary: Object to proposed development at Gelli Bach.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)039 Gelli Bach, Marshfield Proposed – Residential Development Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area and Green Wedge. In principle we would object to such a proposed development in Marshfield as a residential site for a number of reasons: The site is currently designated as Countryside, Special Landscape Area and most importantly Green Wedge, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. We do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This would also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. This development would add strain on leisure facilities in the area, which it has already been identified are inadequate for the number of residents in Marshfield and Castleton. There is a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha. Access to the site is via a privately owned road. This road already has 5 dwellings off it, plus rear access to a 6th property. The design guide for infill properties specifies private driveways should only have access to 5 dwellings, and should be of an adoptable standard. The private access to this site is unsuitable for the intensification of vehicular traffic that the likely residential development of a site of this size would produce. There are precious few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1600.K7 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 512/ Gelli Bach

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)039 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Gelli Bach |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)039, RAS(N)040 These sites are in the Green Wedge, open countryside and in a special landscape area. The principle of development again goes against the policy of development on brownfield sites. Factors to be considered are that all the above sites would add to the burden on the infrastructure of the area, particularly Marshfield Primary School which is at capacity, the existing foul sewerage system which also appears to be at or near capacity, the rural road system and the junction of Marshfield Road with the A48. They will also contribute to additional surface water entering the reed systems of the Wentloog Levels which on occasion is prone to overflowing. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3412.K8 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 512/ Gelli Bach

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)039 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Gelli Bach |
| 3 | 3 | Representation 1. All of these sites are designated either Countryside, Special landscape area, Archaeologically sensitive area or Green wedge and ought not be used for development when there are undeveloped brownfield sites within the LDP area. 2. Marshfield school is already oversubscribed and cannot take more children without significant expansion. 3. Traffic in Marshfield is already congested and school start/finish times make Marshfield Road a nightmare. 4. Drainage in Marshfield is at capacity and cannot support additional dwellings. 5. Local amenities do not support the existing population never mind a larger one. 6. Public Transport links are poor. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K8 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 512/ Gelli Bach

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)039 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Gelli Bach, Marshfield |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed – Residential Development Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area and Green Wedge. Opposed The site is currently designated as Countryside, Special Landscape Area and most importantly Green Wedge, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. I do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This would also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. This development would add strain on leisure facilities in the area, which it has already been identified are inadequate for the number of residents in Marshfield and Castleton. There is a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha. Access to the site is via a privately owned road. This road already has 5 dwellings off it, plus rear access to a 6th property. The design guide for infill properties specifies private driveways should only have access to 5 dwellings, and should be of an adoptable standard. The private access to this site is unsuitable for the intensification of vehicular traffic that the likely residential development of a site of this size would produce. There are precious few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3663.K20 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 512/ Gelli Bach

Summary: Not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)039 Gelli Bach Bakery Lane Castleton

Bakery Lane is a private lane with no highway rights. The lane is narrow with few passing places and not suitable for two way traffic. It has no footway/cycle and is, therefore, reliant on the private motor car. The nearest bus stop is not within the maximum walking distance of 400 metres. The site is located in Parking Zone 6. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K39 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 512/ Gelli Bach

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)039 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Gelli Bach | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Green Wedge/Open Countryside (Greenfield) site* This proposed alternative site would result in further encroachment in to the open countryside contrary to the Strategy for landscape and the allocation of Special Landscape Areas set out in the LDP, and would undermine the allocation of the area as a Green Wedge, the aim of which is to retain the openness of the area. Contrary to ToS P2 C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| | | *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2. This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3849.K7 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 512/ Gelli Bach

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Gelli Bach

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)039, RAS(N)040

These sites are in the Green Wedge, open countryside and in a special landscape area. The principle of development again goes against the policy of development on brownfield sites. Factors to be considered are that all the above sites would add to the burden on the infrastructure of the area, particularly Marshfield Primary School which is at capacity, the existing foul sewerage system which also appears to be at or near capacity, the rural road system and the junction of Marshfield Road with the A48. They will also contribute to additional surface water entering the reed systems of the Wentloog Levels which on occasion is prone to overflowing.

Site,RepnType: 513/ Bakery Lane,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 47.K9 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 513/ Bakery Lane

Summary: Object to proposed development at Bakery Lane

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)040 Bakery Lane, Marshfield Proposed – Residential Development Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area and Green Wedge. In principle we would object to such a proposed development in Marshfield as a residential site for a number of reasons: The site is currently designated as Countryside, Special Landscape Area and most importantly a Green Wedge area, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. We do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This could also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a further residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation. The drainage facilities in Marshfield are at a capacity – further development cannot be supported in the area without significant infrastructure costs. There are few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1600.K8 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 513/ Bakery Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)040 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Bakery Lane |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(N)039, RAS(N)040 These sites are in the Green Wedge, open countryside and in a special landscape area. The principle of development again goes against the policy of development on brownfield sites. Factors to be considered are that all the above sites would add to the burden on the infrastructure of the area, particularly Marshfield Primary School which is at capacity, the existing foul sewerage system which also appears to be at or near capacity, the rural road system and the junction of Marshfield Road with the A48. They will also contribute to additional surface water entering the reens systems of the Wentloog Levels which on occasion is prone to overflowing. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3412.K9 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 513/ Bakery Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)040

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Bakery Lane

3 3 Representation

1. All of these sites are designated either Countryside, Special landscape area, Archaeologically sensitive area or Green wedge and ought not be used for development when there are undeveloped brownfield sites within the LDP area.
2. Marshfield school is already oversubscribed and cannot take more children without significant expansion.
3. Traffic in Marshfield is already congested and school start/finish times make Marshfield Road a nightmare.
4. Drainage in Marshfield is at capacity and cannot support additional dwellings.
5. Local amenities do not support the existing population never mind a larger one.
6. Public Transport links are poor.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K9 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 513/ Bakery Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)040 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Bakery Lane, Marshfield | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed – Residential Development Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area and Green Wedge. Opposed The site is currently designated as Countryside, Special Landscape Area and most importantly a Green Wedge area, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the settlement area marked on the current LDP. We do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This could also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a further residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation. The drainage facilities in Marshfield are at a capacity – further development cannot be supported in the area without significant infrastructure costs. There are few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3663.K21 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 513/ Bakery Lane

Summary: Not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)040 Bakery Lane Marshfield

Bakery Lane is a private lane with no highway rights. The lane is narrow with few passing places and not suitable for two way traffic. It has no footway/cycle and is, therefore, reliant on the private motor car. The nearest bus stop is not within the maximum walking distance of 400 metres. The site is partly located in Parking Zone 5 the remainder in Zone6. This is not a sustainable location for the proposed use.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K40 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 513/ Bakery Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential use

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)040 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Bakery Lane | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Green Wedge/Open Countryside (Greenfield) site * This proposed allocation is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and the allocation of Special Landscape Areas set out in the LDP, and undermines the allocation of the area as a Green Wedge, the aim of which is to retain the openness of the area. Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| | | *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3849.K8 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 513/ Bakery Lane

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Bakery Lane

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)039, RAS(N)040

These sites are in the Green Wedge, open countryside and in a special landscape area. The principle of development again goes against the policy of development on brownfield sites. Factors to be considered are that all the above sites would add to the burden on the infrastructure of the area, particularly Marshfield Primary School which is at capacity, the existing foul sewerage system which also appears to be at or near capacity, the rural road system and the junction of Marshfield Road with the A48. They will also contribute to additional surface water entering the reed systems of the Wentloog Levels which on occasion is prone to overflowing.

Site,RepnType: 514/ Cambrian Drive,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 47.K10 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|--------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 514/ Cambrian Drive

Summary: Object to the proposed development at Cambrian Drive

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)050 Cambrian Drive, Marshfield Proposed – Residential Development Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive Area and Green Wedge. We object to the proposed residential development of this site: The site is currently designated as Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive Area and most importantly a Green Wedge area, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the village settlement boundary. We do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This could also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a further residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation. The drainage facilities in Marshfield are at a capacity – further development cannot be supported in the area without significant infrastructure costs. There are few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial. There is also a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1600.K9 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 514/ Cambrian Drive

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)050

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Cambrian Drive

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)050

Part of this site already has permission for housing. The additional part is in open countryside and any additional development would put pressure on the local infrastructure. The road serving this area is single track and unsuitable for more intense use and the proposal does not support the brownfield site policy.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3206.K2 | Harris, Mr & Mrs J | Derek Prosser Associates | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|---------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 514/ Cambrian Drive

Summary: Support Site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We wish to highlight the sound planning reasons why this site should not be considered for inclusion as an additional housing site.

The site is located at the edge of the village where strong rural qualities are prevalent. Ty-Mawr Lane is particularly rural in character with the Dresnewydd Reen, fronting the site and the length of the road, dominating. The modest number of houses offered by the development of the site would not compensate for the loss of character to this rural edge. Additionally, the road improvements necessary to accommodate the development would be harmful and the junction with Marshfield road inadequate to cope with the additional traffic generated.

While it is suggested that further residential development is necessary in the Plan period to address a short term deficiency of land generally and Marshfield is a village with services and facilities where there is high demand for new housing, the site RAS(N)050 is a more sustainable and appropriate site. It is better related to the village form, to services and facilities in the village, including bus services, and is a more logical extension in relation to the recent Cambrian Drive development and the soon to be developed housing site at Groes Farm, which is included in the site identified. This latter development is immediately alongside the Marshfield Road frontage and provides junction improvements which will accommodate the development of the larger site RAS(N)050.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3412.K10 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 514/ Cambrian Drive

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)050 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cambrian Drive, Marshfield |
| 3 | 3 | Representation 1. All of these sites are designated either Countryside, Special landscape area, Archaeologically sensitive area or Green wedge and ought not be used for development when there are undeveloped brownfield sites within the LDP area. 2. Marshfield school is already oversubscribed and cannot take more children without significant expansion. 3. Traffic in Marshfield is already congested and school start/finish times make Marshfield Road a nightmare. 4. Drainage in Marshfield is at capacity and cannot support additional dwellings. 5. Local amenities do not support the existing population never mind a larger one. 6. Public Transport links are poor. |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K10 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 514/ Cambrian Drive

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)050 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cambrian Drive, Marshfield |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed – Residential Development Current LDP Allocation – Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive Area and Green Wedge. Opposed The site is currently designated as Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive Area and most importantly a Green Wedge area, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the village settlement boundary. I do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This could also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a further residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation. The drainage facilities in Marshfield are at a capacity – further development cannot be supported in the area without significant infrastructure costs. There are few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial. There is also a recognised shortfall of leisure/play space within the Marshfield Ward of 6.79 ha. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3663.K22 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 514/ Cambrian Drive

Summary: Transport Statement and Road Safety Audit required to understand full impact

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)050 Land between Cumbrian Drive and Church Lane Marshfield

The site has no access to Cumbrian Drive. Church lane is narrow in width with few passing places and not suitable for two way traffic. It has no footway/cycle and is, therefore, reliant on the private motor car. Access onto Marshfield will require the removal of the roadside hedge and trees. Any access would be located close to the Church Farm/Marshfield Road/St Mellons Road T junction. This gives rise to possible conflict and junction capacity issues. A Transport Statement and Road Safety Audit will be required. The site is located within Zone 6 of the Parking Guidelines although this could be revised as it located close to local bus stops.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K41 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 514/ Cambrian Drive

Summary: Objection to the proposed allocation of land for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)050 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cambrian Drive |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Green Wedge/Open Countryside (Greenfield) site* This proposed development allocation is contrary to the Strategy for landscape and allocation of Special Landscape Areas set out in the LDP, and undermines the allocation of the area as a Green Wedge, the aim of which is to retain the openness of the area. The site is mainly located within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the majority of the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability tidal flood outlines of the Severn Estuary + Contrary to ToS C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. +For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3849.K9 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 514/ Cambrian Drive

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cambrian Drive

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)050

Part of this site already has permission for housing. The additional part is in open countryside and any additional development would put pressure on the local infrastructure. The road serving this area is single track and unsuitable for more intense use and the proposal does not support the brownfield site policy.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4121.K1 | Bancroft, Mr & Mrs T | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 514/ Cambrian Drive

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cambrian Drive

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We strongly object to the proposed residential development of this site. As stated by Marshfield Community Council, the site is currently designated as Countryside, Special Landscape Area, Archaeologically Sensitive Area and most importantly a Green Wedge area, which would preclude further development. It is also outside the village settlement boundary. We do not support development of Green Wedge when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. The amenities of Marshfield Village are already stretched – there is only one village shop / post office, one pub and no medical facilities. The local primary school is already oversubscribed. There is a single narrow road through the village which would not support increased traffic and public transport is extremely limited. The access road to this site (Church Lane) is narrow and in poor condition. It would not support additional traffic resulting from a new development, and cannot be widened at the entry point due to existing buildings. Development on this site would also have a detrimental impact on existing properties (including the current countryside views from properties in Cambrian Drive), local wildlife and local pollution.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 515/ Former Garden Centre,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 47.K11 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: In principle agree to use of site for retail, business, leisure, tourism or care home but have concerns over facilities and oppose the residential use.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)055 Former Garden Centre, Castleton Proposed – Residential, Retail, Business, Leisure or Tourism Development Current LDP Allocation – Countryside and Green Wedge. In principle we would agree to the proposed use of this site for retail, business, leisure or tourism, or indeed as a Care Home as shown in the planning application already submitted for the site. The site was previously occupied as a Garden Centre open to the public with infrastructure to support vehicle movement and these changes of use would make good use of this now redundant space. There is we believe a demand in the area for Care Home Facilities. Our two concerns are the general lack of amenities in the area, stretched further by these plans and the traffic flows in and out of the site. We would request that the developers of the site look to support improving local amenities, especially for the elderly and a comprehensive review is undertaken to ensure the flows from and to the very busy A48 are considered safe. We would not agree to proposed residential development of the site for the following reasons: Development of Green Wedge for residential use when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This could also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a further residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation. The drainage facilities in Marshfield are at a capacity – further development cannot be supported in the area without significant infrastructure costs. There are few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

357.K9 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water

18/10/2013



E

C

M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: No problems are envisaged at the receiving WwTW as a result of proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site and our local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows. However, off-site watermains and sewers will be required which can be provided by requisition schemes, under the provisions of Sections 41-44 and 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. No problems are envisaged at the receiving Cardiff Bay Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1600.K10 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)055

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Garden Centre

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)055

Planning permission was recently granted for a Care Home on part of this site and the remaining part is used as allotments to meet a local need. This proposal is therefore redundant and should be rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3412.K11 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)055

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Garden Centre, Castleton

3 3 Representation

1. All of these sites are designated either Countryside, Special landscape area, Archaeologically sensitive area or Green wedge and ought not be used for development when there are undeveloped brownfield sites within the LDP area.
 2. Marshfield school is already oversubscribed and cannot take more children without significant expansion.
 3. Traffic in Marshfield is already congested and school start/finish times make Marshfield Road a nightmare.
 4. Drainage in Marshfield is at capacity and cannot support additional dwellings.
 5. Local amenities do not support the existing population never mind a larger one.
 6. Public Transport links are poor.
-

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K11 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: Supports retail, business, leisure and tourism development of site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)055

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Garden Centre, Castleton

3 3 Representation
Proposed – Residential, Retail, Business, Leisure or Tourism Development

Current LDP Allocation – Countryside and Green Wedge.

In principle I support the proposed use of this site for retail, business, leisure or tourism, or indeed as a Care Home as shown in the planning application already submitted for the site.

I am however concerned about the general lack of amenities in the area, stretched further by these plans and the traffic flows in and out of the site. Although I appreciate it is not an S106 obligation, I would like to see the developers of the site look to support improving local amenities, especially for the elderly and that a comprehensive review is undertaken to ensure the flows from and to the very busy A48 are considered safe.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K12 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: Objection to proposed residential element of site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)055 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Garden Centre, Castleton | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I oppose residential development of the site for the following reasons: Development of Green Wedge for residential use when brown field sites are still available and the housing requirement for Newport does not necessitate using Green Wedge. The local school in Marshfield is already oversubscribed and putting extra residential dwellings in the catchment would add further strain on the resources. This could also potentially in the future add strain on the current secondary school Bassaleg, which also is near capacity. The road system in Marshfield is also already congested especially in rush hour and around school drop-off and pick up times, and putting a further residential site in the area would only exacerbate the situation. The drainage facilities in Marshfield are at a capacity – further development cannot be supported in the area without significant infrastructure costs. There are few local amenities, one pub, one small shop and no doctors' surgery, dentist or pharmacy. Adding more residents to the area would not be beneficial. There are only limited public transport routes in Marshfield, with a few infrequent buses daily. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3673.K28 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: Comments on proposed development at Former Garden Centre, Castleton

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
 PROW's on site boundary. Countryside and Green Wedge. Numerous TPOs on Site

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3683.K42 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential, retail, employment, leisure or tourism development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
 RAS(N)055

2 2 Alternative Site Name
 Former Garden Centre, Castleton

3 3 Representation
 The proposal would extend development into an area identified as a Green Wedge in the evidence led LDP. As the purposes of green wedges are to retain the openness of the area, development at this site would be inconsistent with those aims or the strategy of the LDP.

Contrary to ToS
 C2 and CE1, CE2

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3849.K10 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: Objection to proposed development at Former Garden Centre, Castleton

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)055

Planning permission was recently granted for a Care Home on part of this site and the remaining part is used as allotments to meet a local need. This proposal is therefore redundant and should be rejected.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3916.K1 | The Garden Centre Group | Gregory Gray Associates | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: Support for proposed allocation of land for residential, retail, employment, leisure or tourism development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)055

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Former Garden Centre, Castleton

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Gregory Gray Associates is instructed to make representations on behalf of our client, The Garden Centre Group, in respect of the current consultation relating to the Alternative Sites Register.

Our client owns the site of the former Castleton Garden Centre, Newport Road, Castleton and this site was proposed as suitable for alternative uses by our correspondence dated 26th July 2013. The site appears within PART A of the Alternative Sites Register as a new site proposed to be included within the Revised LDP.

My client strongly supports the inclusion of Castleton Garden Centre (ref: RAS(N)055) within the Revised LDP as a site suitable for residential, retail, business, leisure or tourism development.

The site is currently unused following the closure of Castleton Garden Centre and comprises a brownfield site occupied by approximately 5,600 sq.m of floorspace together with extensive areas of hardstanding once used for plant display and car parking.

The site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary of Castleton and forms a small enclave of commercial development with the Premier Inn and Coach and Horses Beefeater Restaurant. It is necessary to find an alternative use for the former garden centre in order that the physical state of the site does not deteriorate to the detriment of the character and amenities of the area, which provides a visually important entry/exit point to the village along the A48.

Furthermore, the site offers a valuable opportunity to make a significant contribution to either the local housing land supply or to the local economy and employment dependent upon the nature of its future use. In this regard, it is considered that the site would be suitable to provide residential development, either comprising a care home or individual residential units, or for employment, food/non-food retail, leisure or tourism uses.

Objective 1 of the Development Plan seeks to ensure that 'all development makes the most efficient use of natural resources by seeking to locate development in the most sustainable locations, minimise the impact upon the environment and make a positive contribution to local communities'. The key way in which the Plan intends to achieve this objective is by focusing development on previously used, brownfield sites and it is considered that the allocation of the Castleton Garden Centre site for alternative purposes would be entirely consistent with the objectives of the Plan.

The Alternative Sites Register indicates that a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has yet to be submitted in relation to Castleton Garden Centre. This now accompanies this letter. The assessment of the site has been based on the Site Specific SA Framework devised by Atkins on behalf of the Council for the assessment of the Strategic Sites.

This concludes that the redevelopment of Castleton Garden Centre for alternative purposes would be in conformity with the majority of the identified SA objectives. Where areas of potential conflict were identified, these primarily derived from a lack of information in relation to the site which would be remedied by the provision of a site specific investigations (e.g. protected species investigation/mitigation), or from an absence of local facilities including retail or employment development within the vicinity of the site. The allocation of Castleton Garden Centre for these uses would serve to remove the conflict with the relevant sustainability criteria.

The site would provide a suitable location for new residential development given its previously developed nature, proximity to an existing settlement, and good public transport links. The site could be made immediately available and there are no known constraints to its viable redevelopment. It is considered that the site would be appropriate to provide specialist residential accommodation such as a care home and it is noted that its allocation for such purposes would be consistent with the Development Plan's stated requirement of taking into account the needs of the elderly. Alternatively, the site would be suitable for employment generating purposes, including Class B uses, retail, tourism or leisure development.

In conclusion, our client strongly supports the allocation of Castleton Garden Centre for alternative purposes within the Revised LDP and requests that the Council allocate it for residential, employment, retail, tourism or leisure purposes within the emerging development plan.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | Yes | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|

See hyperlink.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|----|--|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | No | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|----|--|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3993.K16 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 515/ Former Garden Centre

Summary: Comments on the Wentloog Garden Centre, Marshfield.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)055

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Wentloog Garden Centre, Marshfield.

3 3 Representation

The proposed site at the former Wentloog Garden Centre, Marshfield may be an option depending on it's size and suitability, also on the strength of restrictions/conditions applied to the potential future occupants. It is very close to local businesses and not too far from residential areas.

Site,RepnType: 516/ Whitehead Works,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 357.K10 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 516/ Whitehead Works

Summary: The cumulative effect of this site and H1(52) will require an assessment of the Sewage Pumping Station

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

The topography of the site will need to be assessed to establish where a connection to the public sewerage system can be made as there could be several options dependant of actual site layout. Additionally, a connection may require a pumped arrangement. Foul flows will drain to Alexandra Court Sewage Pumping Station. The cumulative effect of this site and H52 Old Town Dock remainder will require an assessment of this SPS to be undertaken to establish whether improvements are required. Any improvements can be procured through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. No problems are envisaged at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3673.K1 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 516/ Whitehead Works

Summary: No issues.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)006

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Whitehead Works, Cardiff Road

3 3 Representation
Brownfield site. No issues.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

3683.K43 Natural Resources Wales

18/10/2013 E C M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 516/ Whitehead Works

Summary: Recommended that requirement for project-level HRA be made clear in the LDP (so as to protect River Usk SAC)

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)006

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Whitehead Works, Cardiff Road

3 3 Representation
Given its location, any application at the proposed alternative site may need to be the subject of a project level HRA to ensure that the development of the site will not adversely affect the integrity of the River Usk SAC. We advise that this requirement is clearly stated in the Plan.

To meet ToS CE1

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3737.K2 | , Mr and Mrs Pile | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 516/ Whitehead Works

Summary: Support for allocation of land as G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)006 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Whitehead Works Site |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I support inclusion of this site it has very good potential as a residential site with drainage already there. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All parts As a resident directly affected I have valid questions & concerns to raise. |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3982.K13 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 516/ Whitehead Works

Summary: Support for allocation of land as a residential G&T site

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)006 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Whitehead Works Site | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation A site that has good potential as a Residential site. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | Yes |

Site,RepnType: 517/ West Way,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 357.K11 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 517/ West Way

Summary: No problems are envisaged at the receiving WwTW

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site. No problems are envisaged with the public sewerage system for domestic foul discharge or at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic flows from the proposed site. It should be noted that there is a 250mm diameter sewer that traverses the southern and western edges of the site and appropriate diversions/easements will be required.

3663.K23 Newport CC Highways

17/10/2013 E M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 517/ West Way

Summary: No adverse comments relating to the use of this site for bulky goods retail

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)022 West Way Pillgwenlly
I have no adverse comment relating to the use of this site for bulky goods retail

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K44 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 517/ West Way

Summary: Emphasises the need for an HRA to be undertaken (in order to protect River Usk SAC and SSSI)

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)022 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name West Way, Newport | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation District Centre proposed Given its proximity to the River Usk SAC and SSSI we emphasise the importance of carrying out the HRA for these proposals. To meet ToS CE1 | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Site,RepnType: 518/ 28 East Retail Park,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2046.K1 | Axa Sun Life Plc | Rapleys (Bristol) | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | I | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 518/ 28 East Retail Park

Summary: Comment on proposed use at 28 East Retail Park

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)023

2 2 Alternative Site Name
28 East Retail Park

3 3 Representation

We request that 28 East Retail Park, owned and managed by Axa Real Estate be allocated as a District Centre or a defined retail site in the emerging Local Plan, on the basis that it is an established retail park, suitably located to serve the local need and the Eastern expansion area. The allocation or designation of the existing retail park as a district centre or a defined retail park will assist with the Retail Park's continued contribution to the local economy and creation of jobs, and should form part of the retail hierarchy in Newport over the plan period.

The site boundary of the subject site is drawn incorrectly on the Alternative Site Register Mao ref RAS(N)023. The correct boundary is shown on the enclosed site location plan. Therefore, please amend the boundary before the revised Local Plan together with the proposed new sites are submitted to the Inspectorate for examination.

4 4 Additional Material Yes

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes

We would like to reserve our right to speak at the Hearing, in order that we can present our evidence/case to the Inspector clearly.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K10 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 518/ 28 East Retail Park

Summary: Comments on proposed allocation as Out of Centre Retail Park at 28 East Retail Park

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Mostly brownfield. Some potential in eastern end. Some landscape connectivity. Wales coast path route and NCN route 4.

Site,RepnType: 519/ Hartridge Farm Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3507.K4 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 519/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Objection to proposed Educational development at Hartridge Farm Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We do not support this, but would comment that if it is not allocated as a Gypsy and Traveller site we would expect it to be allocated for residential.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K8 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 519/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Constraints on proposed educational development at Hartridge Farm Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Adjacent to a SINC and ancient woodland. Good connectivity within landscape and for ecological potential. PROW issues and accessible natural green space.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K45 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 519/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Highlights flood risk at this site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)017 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Hartridge Farm Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation The proposed site lies partially within Zone C1, as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004). Our Flood Map information, which is updated on a quarterly basis, confirms the site to be within the 0.5% (1 in 200 year) and 0.1% (1 in 1000 year) annual probability flood outlines + To meet ToS C2 and CE2 (See additional information and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material +For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Site,RepnType: 521/ Land off Sterndale Bennett Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3673.K21 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 521/ Land off Sterndale Bennett Road

Summary: Supports proposed allocation of SINC on Land off Sterndale Bennett Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Support allocation as SINC

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3683.K46 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 521/ Land off Sterndale Bennett Road

Summary: Welcomes the fact that the accompanying map correctly identifies the SINC

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)044

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Sterndale Bennet Road

3 3 Representation
As SINC's are proposed to be protected under Revised Deposit Plan Policy CE9, we welcome the proposal to identify them correctly on the proposals map.

To meet ToS CE1

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 522/ Land off Dunstable Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3673.K22 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 522/ Land off Dunstable Road

Summary: Supports proposed allocation of SINC at Land off Dunstable Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Support allocation as SINC

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3683.K47 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 522/ Land off Dunstable Road

Summary: Welcomes the fact that the accompanying map correctly identifies the SINC

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)045

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Dunstable Road

3 3 Representation
As SINC's are proposed to be protected under Revised Deposit Plan Policy CE9, we welcome the proposal to identify them correctly on the proposals map.

To meet ToS CE1

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 523/ Land off Ringland Circle,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3673.K23 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 523/ Land off Ringland Circle

Summary: Supports proposed allocation of SINC at Land North of Ringland Circle

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Support allocation as SINC

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3683.K48 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 523/ Land off Ringland Circle

Summary: Welcomes the fact that the accompanying map correctly identifies the SINC

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)046

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land off Ringland Circle

3 3 Representation
As SINC's are proposed to be protected under Revised Deposit Plan Policy CE9, we welcome the proposal to identify them correctly on the proposals map.

To meet ToS CE1

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 524/ Hartridge Farm Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3076.K7 | Storage Giant | | | 09/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 524/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Hartridge Farm Road

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)057

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Hartridge Farm Road

3 3 Representation

It is my view that the above named site at Hartridge Farm Road fails the C1 and C4 consistency test, because I cannot see that use of this land as traveller accommodation has taken into account the more relevant development and strategies in the Queensway Meadows area, or that it has taken account of community strategies. Also, I believe it fails CE2 coherence and effectiveness test, because NCC already have a number of more suitable sites to consider.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

3507.K5 Newport CC Property Services

18/10/2013

E

O

M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 524/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Objection to proposed Health Centre development at Hartridge Farm Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We do not support this, but would comment that if it is not allocated as a Gypsy and Traveller site we would expect it to be allocated for residential.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K49 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 524/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Comments same as for RAS(N)017 (highlights flood risk at site)

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)057 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Hartridge Farm Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Please see our comments on RAS(N)017 above | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material +For sites located within Zone C1: TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Site,RepnType: 525/ Land at Risca Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3070.K1 | Woodland Amenities (Rogerstone) Ltd., | | | 16/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 525/ Land at Risca Road

Summary: Object to proposed site at Risca Road the objectors are the owners of the site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)025, 2073.C1, 2073.C2 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land at Risca Road, Rogerstone | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation The applicants state that the land is owned by them. It is not. It is owned by Woodland Amenities. They also state tha the land is owned by the propose. It is not. They also state that there have been no planning refusals in respect of the site. This is also not true as some years ago planning permission was refused on appeal on that part of the land that abuts Pontymason Lane at the canal bridge. Woodlands Amenities (Rogerstone) Ltd have no connection with the applicants and have written to them some months ago to this effect. They appear to not have taken any notice of their written promise to us that they would not include our land in their applicaiotsns in future. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3520.K7 | Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited | Savills | | 26/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 525/ Land at Risca Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)025

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Risca Road

3 3 Representation

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | Yes | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--|

Savills is instructed, on behalf of Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited ('Walters'), to make comments on Newport Council's 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Alcan/Novelis factory site (now known as Jubilee Park) was granted on 10 August 2013. In this time, considerable work has been done by Walters to allow land reclamation and remediation works to start on site. Alongside this work, Walters has also submitted to the Council a reserved matters application for the first phase of infrastructure and landscaping works. All this activity and momentum is very positive and reinforces their commitment to Jubilee Park and its future development in the plan period.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP and Revised Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations provide the context to our comments on the proposed 'Alternative Sites'. There is significant alignment between Walters' ambitions for the site and the content of the emerging LDP and, on this basis, much of what was said to the Deposit Plan(s) is positive and supportive. However, there were some areas of the plan that we consider can and should be improved and these are carried forward in our representations to the 'Alternative Sites'.

The main concern in these representations relate to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over the plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations.

Jubilee Park is allocated under Policy H1(54), which is identified to deliver nearly 925 new homes (although the outline consent allows up to 1,200) within the plan period.

The draft plans' strategic policies, Policy SP1(ii), makes it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction – a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Jubilee Park, remains a priority throughout the plan period. This priority gives those committed brownfield sites an opportunity to deliver the housing proposed without releasing excess land that is not required to meeting need during the plan period. As such, we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be released only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The representations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than the Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The figure that the sites summarised under parts i – iv of their policy comes to nearly 12,000, which is substantially more land than is required and, on the face of it, is a significant and unnecessary contingency.

If there is doubt about performance, the allocations under Policy H1 are so large (with the possibility of delivering more) that, even with the removal of the greenfield releases both the 7,500 figure and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. Therefore, the reasonable approach, which was set out in our representations would be to reserve any greenfield sites for release at a later stage of the plan (if required at all). In this regard, our representations also referred to the need to establish a clearer sequence in points i – iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1. It should, therefore, be made clear that the preference in each category will be for the redevelopment of previously developed sites rather than through the release of greenfield land. This installs the proper planning sequence in accordance with national policy.

Alternative Sites

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

Regardless of this over provision and as stated above, national policy includes a strong sequential preference for the best and most effective use of land in urban areas – and especially previously developed land, which should be used before greenfield or undeveloped sites. The adopted development plan and emerging LDP also clearly reference the sequential priority to be given to the effective use of previously developed sites.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| <p>However, all those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes

There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.

3683.K50 Natural Resources Wales 18/10/2013 E O M

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 525/ Land at Risca Road

Summary: Objection to the proposed allocation of land for residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)025

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Risca, Risca Road, Rogerstone

3 3 Representation

Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as AS (N) 053 Green wedge/ Open Countryside (Greenfield) site*

This proposed alternative site is contrary to the Strategy for landscape as set out in the LDP, and undermines the allocation of the area as a Green Wedge, the aim of which is to retain the openness of the area.

Contrary to ToS
C2, CE1, CE2

(See additional comments and hyperlink)

4 4 Additional Material Yes

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4024.K1 | Evans, Cllr Chris | | | 30/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 525/ Land at Risca Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)025

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Risca Road

3 3 Representation

Hi, with reference to the above sites, i would like to register my objection, to both sites, for the following reasons...

both alternative sites are Greenfield sites positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of Brown field sites (like the old Alcan site, which, will, i believe provide enough housing in Rogerstone) 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. As we're aware forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities. The plan as it stands, allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in these rural locations cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation sites 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.

I suggest that these sites are not included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4037.K1 | Bond, Cllr Tom | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 525/ Land at Risca Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)025

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Risca Road

3 3 Representation

I am writing to object to the above listed alternative sites suggested for inclusion in the LDP. They are greenfield sites, which is at odds with the LDP's intention to reuse brownfield sites. Especially in light of the IPCC's latest report on climate, it is incumbent on all of us to do what we can to protect spaces that can be used for wildlife habitat and carbon sequestration, and focus our development on land that has already been used.

Since Newport has already managed to meet and exceed our housing needs for the foreseeable future with allocations in the Plan, it is completely unnecessary to add further capacity, especially on greenfield rural land, when our priority should be brownfield land in areas where we can promote alternative forms of travel.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4055.K1 | Fraser, Rita | | | 09/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|---------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 525/ Land at Risca Road

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)025

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Risca Road

3 3 Representation

The road from Risca to Newport is so busy it would not be able to cope with a travellers site in any of the Rogerstone areas.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4128.K10 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 525/ Land at Risca Road

Summary: Historic environment comments on Land at Risca Road.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)025

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Risca Road

3 3 Representation
This site is located adjacent to the Monmouthshire and Brecon Canal Conservation Area. Development is likely to have an impact on the character of the adjacent conservation area.

Site,RepnType: 526/ Cwrt Camlas,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3520.K8 | Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited | Savills | | 26/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Cwrt Camlas, Rogerstone

3 3 Representation

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLDP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

All those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

Yes

Savills is instructed, on behalf of Walters Land (Rogerstone) Limited ('Walters'), to make comments on Newport Council's 'Alternative Sites' stage of the Local Development Plan (LDP). Our comments relate to some of the new sites proposed by representors to be included in the LDP for housing use.

Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Alcan/Novelis factory site (now known as Jubilee Park) was granted on 10 August 2013. In this time, considerable work has been done by Walters to allow land reclamation and remediation works to start on site. Alongside this work, Walters has also submitted to the Council a reserved matters application for the first phase of infrastructure and landscaping works. All this activity and momentum is very positive and reinforces their commitment to Jubilee Park and its future development in the plan period.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the 'Alternative Sites' consultation form.

Deposit LDP and Revised Deposit LDP

Representations were made to the Deposit LDP (DLDP) (submitted in May 2012) and Revised Deposit LDP (RDLP) (submitted in July 2013). The representations provide the context to our comments on the proposed 'Alternative Sites'. There is significant alignment between Walters' ambitions for the site and the content of the emerging LDP and, on this basis, much of what was said to the Deposit Plan(s) is positive and supportive. However, there were some areas of the plan that we consider can and should be improved and these are carried forward in our representations to the 'Alternative Sites'.

The main concern in these representations relate to the total amount of development that the plan seeks to allocate for the City over the plan period and the inclusion of a number of new greenfield allocations.

Jubilee Park is allocated under Policy H1(54), which is identified to deliver nearly 925 new homes (although the outline consent allows up to 1,200) within the plan period.

The draft plans' strategic policies, Policy SP1(ii), makes it clear that the LDP's priority is to secure the regeneration of previously developed sites before greenfield land is released for development. This is sensible and sustainable and reflects a strong and established national policy direction – a direction to which Policy H1 should accord with. Our representations, therefore, sought to ensure that the significance of the City's key projects is recognised and that the development of previously developed sites, such as Jubilee Park, remains a priority throughout the plan period. This priority gives those committed brownfield sites an opportunity to deliver the housing proposed without releasing excess land that is not required to meeting need during the plan period. As such, we recommended that any greenfield sites that do survive are kept in reserve and will be released only if there is a demonstrable failure of the City's stock of previously developed sites.

The representations also confirmed that Policy H1 of the RDLP proposes a very high amount of housing that is a lot more than the level set out in SP10 and significantly more than the Welsh Government's projections (7,500). The figure that the sites summarised under parts i – iv of their policy comes to nearly 12,000, which is substantially more land than is required and, on the face of it, is a significant and unnecessary contingency.

If there is doubt about performance, the allocations under Policy H1 are so large (with the possibility of delivering more) that, even with the removal of the greenfield releases both the 7,500 figure and 8,750 increase can be retained with a substantial contingency. Therefore, the reasonable approach, which was set out in our representations would be to reserve any greenfield sites for release at a later stage of the plan (if required at all). In this regard, our representations also referred to the need to establish a clearer sequence in points i – iv of Policy SP10. At the moment there is no distinction between the new allocations in Policy H1. It should, therefore, be made clear that the preference in each category will be for the redevelopment of previously developed sites rather than through the release of greenfield land. This installs the proper planning sequence in accordance with national policy.

Alternative Sites

In light of the current over provision of housing allocations of the RDLP and with the Council's proposed allocations (particularly the greenfield allocations) not being required to meet housing need over the plan period, there is definitely no requirement to allocate additional housing sites as part of the 'Alternative Sites' process (as included on the attached schedule).

Regardless of this over provision and as stated above, national policy includes a strong sequential preference for the best and most effective use of land in urban areas – and especially previously developed land, which should be used before greenfield or undeveloped sites. The adopted development plan and emerging LDP also clearly reference the sequential priority to be given to the effective use of previously developed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

However, all those sites put forward by representors as part of the 'Alternative Sites' stage of the LDP relate to sites within the countryside. Most of these are allocated Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) or Green Wedges. The development of those sites put forward as part of this process would be contrary to national and local policy and are not necessary to meet housing need over the plan period. There is, therefore, no need to consider these sites any further with sufficient brownfield sites available to meet housing requirements.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | Yes |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|

There is no need to allocate additional housing sites (particularly greenfield sites) as there are sufficient brownfield sites in Newport to satisfy housing need in the plan period.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K24 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Transport Assessment required to confirm junction capacity

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

RAS(N)027 Cwrt Camlas High Cross

The highway infrastructure to access this site has already been provided. A Transport Assessment will be required to confirm that adequate capacity on the Cwrt Camlas/High Cross Road junction has sufficient capacity to deal with the additional traffic. The site is currently located in Zone 6 of the Parking Standards although reassessment of the site after approval is anticipated to place the site in Zone 4.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K51 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cwrt Camlas | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed residential use in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside (Greenfield) site* The proposal would result in further encroachment into the open countryside, for which the LDP has demonstrated no additional need to that development already identified in the LDP strategy. The proposal would therefore undermine the LDP strategy. * | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3700.K1 | Moss, Mr James | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3716.K1 | Lake, Mr Richard | | | 01/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cwrt Camlas | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation This site is unsuitable for development based on the following reasons. 1)The entrance to the land via Cwrt Camlas/Fford Camlas and Diwedd Camlas has 3 blind bends and multiple width restrictions. This will cause accidents. 2) It would increase the vast amount of traffic using Junction 27 which is always at a crawl at rush hours. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4024.K2 | Evans, Cllr Chris | | | 30/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Cwrt Camlas

3 3 Representation

Hi, with reference to the above sites, i would like to register my objection, to both sites, for the following reasons...

both alternative sites are Greenfield sites positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The plan seeks to promote the reuse of Brown field sites (like the old Alcan site, which, will, i believe provide enough housing in Rogerstone) 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. As we're aware forecast housing need has been assessed in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities. The plan as it stands, allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in these rural locations cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the representation sites 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.

I suggest that these sites are not included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4037.K2 | Bond, Cllr Tom | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Cwrt Camlas

3 3 Representation

I am writing to object to the above listed alternative sites suggested for inclusion in the LDP. They are greenfield sites, which is at odds with the LDP's intention to reuse brownfield sites. Especially in light of the IPCC's latest report on climate, it is incumbent on all of us to do what we can to protect spaces that can be used for wildlife habitat and carbon sequestration, and focus our development on land that has already been used.

Since Newport has already managed to meet and exceed our housing needs for the foreseeable future with allocations in the Plan, it is completely unnecessary to add further capacity, especially on greenfield rural land, when our priority should be brownfield land in areas where we can promote alternative forms of travel.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4055.K2 | Fraser, Rita | | | 09/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|---------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Cwrt Camlas

3 3 Representation

The road from Risca to Newport is so busy it would not be able to cope with a travellers site in any of the Rogerstone areas.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4090.K1 | Sanderson, Mr Bob | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4091.K1 | Hawkins, Ms Paula | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4092.K1 | Parsons, Mr David | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4098.K1 | Griffiths, Tutor | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4100.K1 | George, Charmaine | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4101.K1 | George, Mr Chris | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4102.K1 | Reed, Doreen | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Object to proposed development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I would like to object and protest and bring to your attention several points that are against this plan.

Traffic is of cause a very big factor. This is already a problem I the area. A huge amount of traffic coming around the roundabout from a few directions, then traffic streaming up the Glasllwch Cresecent into Highcross oftern causing long hold-ups. There would obviously be more and more traffic if ths Cwt Camlas Site should go ahead. I think double would be about right. Cwm lane and Cefn Walk would have to suffer more and more traffic ocngestion. The access from these Roads are already a hazard - with more traffic it would be a nightmare.

This site is much too near Fourteen Locks and The old Towing Path, which is now a place to visit after volunteers have lovingly restored this area, and would not like to see it again in disrepair and a state of ruin, - for what ever reason.

Again in my opnion the proposed site is much too near the new School.

Currently the area is a habitat for grazing horses, wild life and vegetation.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4103.K1 | Currier, Mr Michael | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4104.K1 | Currier, Lyndsay | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4105.K1 | Jonas Franzen, Mr Carl | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Object to proposed development at Cwrt Camlas

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number AS(N)005 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cwrt Camlas | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Access to and around the estate - Entrance to the estate is diabolical even with the double yellow lines part way in. We still have a problem with commuters parking Monday to Friday and even visitors' cars to the houses on the main road using Cwrt Camlas to park. Constant traffic in & out of Serrenu Centre 7 days a week and on most evenings due to leisure activities there. The roads throughout the estate aren't wide enough to cope with more traffic. The corner by 7 Ffordd Camlas is at 90 degrees and too narrow for 2 moving vehicles to pass. One has to give way to the other even without a vehicle parked on the corner causing further hindrance. High Cross Road would also not cope with more traffic mornings & evenings as at commuting times traffic is at present tailed back to Bethesda queuing to get to the M4. Noise & Environment - ground preparation, the actual house building, heavy machinery, lorries full of material, dust & debris, contractor & builders vehicles in and out of the estate and being dumped outside our houses, Wildlife - our small estate is very sought after due to its quietness & being close to the countryside. We see foxes, moles, squirrels, mice, frogs, hedgehogs, grass snakes, lizards, numerous wild birds & even a peregrine falcon. Some of our trees are also protected. Schools - the council will see from this year's applications that our local schools cannot cope with the current demand which is getting worse each year due to more houses being built in the area. With Jubilee Park commencing in the near future, although it is planned to eventually have its own school, this is not going to be completed until a few phases into the massive build. In the meantime, the children occupying these new homes will need to be placed somewhere putting more pressure on our already maxed out schools. With so much waste land available due to factory closures around Newport it seems ludicrous that our council would allow developers to destroy such valuable countryside rather than build on derelict land. The city of Newport needs urgent redevelopment. The council should be protecting our city's assets and focus on the run down areas. I therefore object to the proposed site at Cwrt Camlas and strongly believe it should not be included in the Deposit LDP. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4106.K1 | Moss, Helen | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Access to and around the estate - Entrance to the estate is diabolical even with the double yellow lines part way in. We still have a problem with commuters parking Monday to Friday and even visitors' cars to the houses on the main road using Cwrt Camlas to park. Constant traffic in & out of Serrenu Centre 7 days a week and on most evenings due to leisure activities there. The roads throughout the estate aren't wide enough to cope with more traffic. The corner by 7 Ffordd Camlas is at 90 degrees and too narrow for 2 moving vehicles to pass. One has to give way to the other even without a vehicle parked on the corner causing further hindrance. High Cross Road would also not cope with more traffic mornings & evenings as at commuting times traffic is at present tailed back to Bethesda queuing to get to the M4. Noise & Environment - ground preparation, the actual house building, heavy machinery, lorries full of material, dust & debris, contractor & builders vehicles in and put of the estate and being dumped outside our houses, Wildlife - our small estate is very sought after due to its quietness & being close to the countryside. We see foxes, moles, squirrels, mice, frogs, hedgehogs, grass snakes, lizards, numerous wild birds & even a peligree falcon. Some of our trees are also protected. Schools - the council will see from this year's applications that our local schools cannot cope with the current demand which is getting worse each year due to more houses being built in the area. With Jubilee Park commencing in the near future, although it is planned to eventually have its own school, this is not going to be completed until a few phases into the massive build. In the meantime, the children occupying these new homes will need to be placed somewhere putting more pressure on our already maxed out schools. With so much waste land available due to factory closures around Newport it seems ludicrous that our council would allow developers to destroy such valuable countryside rather than build on derelict land. The city of Newport needs urgent redevelopment. The council should be protecting our city's assets and focus on the run down areas. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4109.K1 | Moss, Ms Rachel | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Object to the Alternative Site suggested at Cwrt Camlas

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cwrt Camlas |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP. I object for the following reasons: The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4112.K1 | Moghaddas, M | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why
PLANNERS

Yes

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4113.K1 | Baxter, Sharon | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4114.K1 | Baxter, Terence | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4115.K1 | Moghaddas-Davies, Janet | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes. The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity. This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage. The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road. I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

I need to consult with the Inspector concerning some issues.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4116.K1 | Jones, Elaine | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objects to the suggested site at Cwrt Camlas

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cwrt Camlas |
| 3 | 3 | Representation <p>I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>I object for the following reasons:</p> <p>The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes.</p> <p>The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity.</p> <p>This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage.</p> <p>The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road.</p> <p>I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4117.K1 | Peckham, Kimberley | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Object to the suggested site at Cwrt Camlas

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cwrt Camlas |
| 3 | 3 | Representation <p>I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>I object for the following reasons:</p> <p>The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes.</p> <p>The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity.</p> <p>This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage.</p> <p>The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road.</p> <p>I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4118.K1 | Peckham, Abigale | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Object to suggested site at Cwrt Camlas

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cwrt Camlas |
| 3 | 3 | Representation <p>I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>I object for the following reasons:</p> <p>The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes.</p> <p>The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity.</p> <p>This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage.</p> <p>The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road.</p> <p>I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4119.K1 | Peckham, Colin | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Object to the suggested site at Cwrt Camlas.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cwrt Camlas |
| 3 | 3 | Representation <p>I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>I object for the following reasons:</p> <p>The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes.</p> <p>The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity.</p> <p>This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage.</p> <p>The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road.</p> <p>I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4120.K1 | Peckham, Ceri | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Object to the suggested site at Cwrt Camlas

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Cwrt Camlas |
| 3 | 3 | Representation <p>I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>I object for the following reasons:</p> <p>The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes.</p> <p>The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity.</p> <p>This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage.</p> <p>The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road.</p> <p>I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.</p> |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4122.K1 | Beavis, Greg | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Objects to the suggested site at Cwrt Camlas

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Cwrt Camlas

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and agree with and fully support the conclusion of the Council's officer response from the Local Planning Authority (Initial Consultation Report, Appendix 6, Alternative Sites Assessment Report, June 2013, pages 14-16 inclusive) in relation to this site and why it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

I object for the following reasons:

The site is a Greenfield site positioned in land designated as countryside in the Deposit LDP. The Deposit LDP rightly 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 obviously 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. I understand that the Council has assessed the forecast housing need in the context of population and employment projections and current market realities and I believe that the Deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to meet this requirement. Additional housing allocations in a rural location cannot therefore be justified. Furthermore, the release of the above 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. I therefore agree with the Council's recommendation that the above site should not be included in the Local Development Plan for residential purposes.

The proposed residential development on the site would cause significant damage to the natural habitat of the site – which is currently unspoilt countryside with a well-developed ecosystem supporting a myriad of wildlife. The proposed site would represent an inappropriate and unacceptable development into the open countryside. The proposed site is also unnecessary because of other proposed developments such as the former Alcan site which presents a major regeneration opportunity.

This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 - Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is therefore potential for the proposed development to have an adverse impact on the setting of the ancient monument – the only ancient monument in the immediate area and one which I and many other local residents feel strongly about preserving as part of our local heritage.

The proposed development would also create new dangers for the current residents of High Cross Reach estate (which leads to Cwrt Camlas) and anyone accessing the estate from Highcross Road. The existing access road (Ffordd Camlas) from Highcross Road leading into the High Cross Reach estate is already congested on a daily basis with the traffic to and from the existing number of homes on this estate plus of course the traffic to and from the Serennu Centre (especially on weekdays). Any further traffic to and from the site, as a result of the proposed residential development in Cwrt Camlas, would be likely to cause a dangerous level of road congestion and would certainly increase the risk of Road Traffic Accidents throughout the estate and particularly in and around the access road to the estate from Highcross Road.

I therefore object to the proposed Alternative Site of Cwrt Camlas (RAS(N)027) and contend that it should not be included within the Deposit LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4128.K11 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 526/ Cwrt Camlas

Summary: Historic environment comments on Cwrt Camlas.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Cwrt Camlas

3 3 Representation

This site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument (MM184 Fourteen Locks). Depending on the nature of development, there is potential to impact on the setting of the monument.

Site,RepnType: 527/ Bethesda Field,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K25 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 527/ Bethesda Field

Summary: Site already has permission

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)035 Bethesda Field Rogerstone

This site has received approval at Planning Appeal for residential use.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3673.K16 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 527/ Bethesda Field

Summary: Supports proposed amendment from housing proposal to environmental space at Bethesda Field

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Support proposed use as environmental open space. Adjacent to Cefn Wood SINC.

Site,RepnType: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 28.K4 | Newbridge Construction Ltd | Boyer Planning | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for Gypsy and Traveller transit site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)016 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)016 seeks to allocated the existing Tredegar Park Caravan site as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Site. The proposed alternative use is wholly inappropriate within the location. Firstly, whilst the existing site does provide accommodation for caravans it is for paying visitors and is run as a business. Theuse as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit site would result in the loss of this employment on site. Secondly, the site is set within the Tredegar House and Park Conservation Area which is centred on the Grade I listed Tredegar House, Stable Block and Orangery, the numerous grade II and II* listed buildings grouped around the house and the whole of the adjoining park, which is itself listed Grade II*. The use of the site for Gypsy and Traveler Transit Accommodation would have significant implications and impacts upon the historic setting. In this regard the importance of finding the correct location is also outlined within the Welsh Government - Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites in Wales (July 2009) which at paragraph 3.2.4 highlights that "It is important that if a location is considered inappropriate for residential use, either private or social then it should not be considered appropriate for a Gypsy Traveller site. Given that residential development (market and social) would be severely restricted in such a location, it is therefore inappropriate site for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 47.K3 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Do not support the allocation of a Gypsy and Traveller site at Tredegar House Caravan Park

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)016 Tredegar House Caravan Park Proposed – Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Current LDP Allocation – Conservation Area and Special Landscape Area Marshfield Community Council would oppose in principle the inclusion of a gypsy and traveller site at Tredegar House Caravan Park. The site is privately leased by the Caravan Club from the National Trust and is a popular and fully utilised facility for private campers and tourists, who bring revenue to the local area. The site is a profitable going concern, providing local employment. The site is accessed from the public highway via the grounds of Tredegar House, which is National Trust owned land, frequented by local members of the public and tourists. There is no direct access to the site from the public highways. Marshfield Community Council believes that conversion of this site to a gypsy and traveller site would (i) result in lost jobs for employees of the existing site, (ii) adversely affect the attraction of tourism to the local area and thereby result in lost revenue to the local area, (iii) increased traffic flow of commercial vehicles through National Trust parkland would pose an increased road safety risk to local members of the public and tourists. Marshfield Community Council requests that this proposed site is removed from the revised Local Development Plan.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 182.K1 | The National Trust | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|--------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation at Tredegar House Caravan Park

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

AS(N)016 Tredegar House Caravan Park

This alternative site proposal suggests that Tredegar House Caravan Park should be identified as a transit site for travellers. A number of representors to the deposit plan made this suggestion as an alternative to the proposed allocation at Celtic Way.

Many representations have described the site as being owned by Newport City Council. While the council retains the freehold of the caravan site, it forms part of the long-term lease of Tredegar House and Park to the National Trust. We in turn have a lease (inherited from the council) with the Caravan Club, who operate the site.

The Caravan Site is in active use and contributes to the visitor economy of Newport and the upkeep of the heritage assets at Tredegar House. It also has a beneficial relationship with other tourism uses at Tredegar House and makes a further indirect contribution to the conservation and public enjoyment of Tredegar House.

The Council's ownership rights do not permit it to change the caravan park into a transit site without the agreement of the National Trust and the Caravan Club. The National Trust would consider that changing the caravan park into a transit site would create conflict with the other tourism uses at Tredegar House and diminish the site's contribution to the upkeep of Tredegar. Leaving aside the question of how the caravan park compares in planning terms to any other site proposed, it cannot be considered available.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 321.K4 | Newbridge Ests & John Fmly | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land as Gypsy and Traveller transit site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)016

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Tredegar House Caravan Park

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)016 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)016 seeks to allocated the existing Tredegar Park Caravan site as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Site.

The proposed alternative use is wholly inappropriate within the location. Firstly, whilst the existing site does provide accommodation for caravans it is for paying visitors and is run as a business. The use as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit site would result in the loss of this employment on site.

Secondly, the site is set within the Tredegar House and Park Conservation Area which is centred on the Grade I listed Tredegar House, Stable Block and Orangery, the numerous grade II and II* listed buildings grouped around the house and the whole of the adjoining park, which is itself listed Grade II*. The use of the site for Gypsy and Traveler Transit Accommodation would have significant implications and impacts upon the historic setting.

In this regard the importance of finding the correct location is also outlined within the Welsh Government - Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites in Wales (July 2009) which at paragraph 3.2.4 highlights that "It is important that if a location is considered inappropriate for residential use, either private or social then it should not be considered appropriate for a Gypsy Traveller site. Given that residential development (market and social) would be severely restricted in such a location, it is therefore inappropriate site for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes

357.K25 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water

18/10/2013 E C M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: A water supply can be provided and the local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site and our local sewerage network can accommodate foul flows. It should be noted that there is a 350mm diameter watermain and sewer crossing the centre of the site for which appropriate easements/diversions will be required. No problems are envisaged at the receiving Nash Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic foul flows from these proposed sites.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1117.K5 | Herbert, Richard | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land as a Gypsy and Traveller transit site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)016 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)016 seeks to allocated the existing Tredegar Park Caravan site as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Site. The proposed alternative use is wholly inappropriate within the location. Firstly, whilst the existing site does provide accommodation for caravans it is for paying visitors and is run as a business. The use as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit site would result in the loss of this employment on site. Secondly, the site is set within the Tredegar House and Park Conservation Area which is centred on the Grade I listed Tredegar House, Stable Block and Orangery, the numerous grade II and II* listed buildings grouped around the house and the whole of the adjoining park, which is itself listed Grade II*. The use of the site for Gypsy and Traveler Transit Accommodation would have significant implications and impacts upon the historic setting. In this regard the importance of finding the correct location is also outlined within the Welsh Government - Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites in Wales (July 2009) which at paragraph 3.2.4 highlights that "It is important that if a location is considered inappropriate for residential use, either private or social then it should not be considered appropriate for a Gypsy Traveller site. Given that residential development (market and social) would be severely restricted in such a location, it is therefore inappropriate site for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1418.K4 | Pontymister Dev Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for Gypsy and Traveller transit site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)016 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)016 seeks to allocated the existing Tredegar Park Caravan site as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Site. The proposed alternative use is wholly inappropriate within the location. Firstly, whilst the existing site does provide accommodation for caravans it is for paying visitors and is run as a business. The use as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit site would result in the loss of this employment on site. Secondly, the site is set within the Tredegar House and Park Conservation Area which is centred on the Grade I listed Tredegar House, Stable Block and Orangery, the numerous grade II and II* listed buildings grouped around the house and the whole of the adjoining park, which is itself listed Grade II*. The use of the site for Gypsy and Traveler Transit Accommodation would have significant implications and impacts upon the historic setting. In this regard the importance of finding the correct location is also outlined within the Welsh Government - Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites in Wales (July 2009) which at paragraph 3.2.4 highlights that "It is important that if a location is considered inappropriate for residential use, either private or social then it should not be considered appropriate for a Gypsy Traveller site. Given that residential development (market and social) would be severely restricted in such a location, it is therefore inappropriate site for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1600.K3 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)016

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Tredegar House Caravan Park

3 3 Representation
RAS(N)016
This proposal is already a flourishing site run by the Caravanning and Camping Club and should be rejected

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1666.K4 | Murray, Mrs H E | Boyer Planning | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Tredegar House Caravan Park

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)016 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)016 seeks to allocated the existing Tredegar Park Caravan site as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Site. The proposed alternative use is wholly inappropriate within the location. Firstly, whilst the existing site does provide accommodation for caravans it is for paying visitors and is run as a business. The use as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit site would result in the loss of this employment on site. Secondly, the site is set within the Tredegar House and Park Conservation Area which is centred on the Grade I listed Tredegar House, Stable Block and Orangery, the numerous grade II and II* listed buildings grouped around the house and the whole of the adjoining park, which is itself listed Grade II*. The use of the site for Gypsy and Traveler Transit Accommodation would have significant implications and impacts upon the historic setting. In this regard the importance of finding the correct location is also outlined within the Welsh Government - Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites in Wales (July 2009) which at paragraph 3.2.4 highlights that "It is important that if a location is considered inappropriate for residential use, either private or social then it should not be considered appropriate for a Gypsy Traveller site. Given that residential development (market and social) would be severely restricted in such a location, it is therefore inappropriate site for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2072.K4 | Newbridge Estates Ltd | Boyer Planning | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for G&T transit site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(N)016 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(N)016 seeks to allocated the existing Tredegar Park Caravan site as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Site. The proposed alternative use is wholly inappropriate within the location. Firstly, whilst the existing site does provide accommodation for caravans it is for paying visitors and is run as a business. The use as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit site would result in the loss of this employment on site. Secondly, the site is set within the Tredegar House and Park Conservation Area which is centred on the Grade I listed Tredegar House, Stable Block and Orangery, the numerous grade II and II* listed buildings grouped around the house and the whole of the adjoining park, which is itself listed Grade II*. The use of the site for Gypsy and Traveler Transit Accommodation would have significant implications and impacts upon the historic setting. In this regard the importance of finding the correct location is also outlined within the Welsh Government - Good Practice Guide in Designing Gypsy Traveller Sites in Wales (July 2009) which at paragraph 3.2.4 highlights that "It is important that if a location is considered inappropriate for residential use, either private or social then it should not be considered appropriate for a Gypsy Traveller site. Given that residential development (market and social) would be severely restricted in such a location, it is therefore inappropriate site for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3412.K3 | Wilson, Mr Paul | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)016

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Tredegar House Caravan Park

3 3 Representation

None of these sites seem appropriate either because of access or location and 3 of the 4 sites would put additional pressure on already stretched services in Marshfield, particularly the school, shop, other amenities and roads.

3507.K3 Newport CC Property Services

18/10/2013 E O M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Tredegar House Caravan Park

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
We do not support this.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K3 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed – Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Current LDP Allocation – Conservation Area and Special Landscape Area I am opposed to the inclusion of a gypsy and traveller site at Tredegar House Caravan Park. The site is privately leased by the Caravan Club from the National Trust and is a popular and fully utilised facility for private campers and tourists, who bring revenue to the local area. The site is a profitable going concern, providing local employment. The site is accessed from the public highway via the grounds of Tredegar House, which is National Trust owned land, frequented by local members of the public and tourists. There is no direct access to the site from the public highways. I believe adopting this site proposal would result in lost jobs for employees of the existing site, (ii) adversely affect the attraction of tourism to the local area and thereby result in lost revenue to the local area, (iii) increased traffic flow of commercial vehicles through National Trust parkland would pose an increased road safety risk to local members of the public and tourists. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3673.K7 | Newport CC - Green Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Constraints on proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Tredegar House Caravan Park

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 3 | 3 | Representation Immediately adjacent to ancient woodland and pond. Land area within Landscape and Garden of historic value, within National Trust 99yr lease area active Caravan club of Great Britain site |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3692.K9 | Lawrence, Tracey | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravn Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation As per previous correspondence with NCC I request that the proposed Traveller Transit Site at Tredegar House Caravan Park be deleted from the LDP on the grounds that the area should remain a caravan park and be used by all caravan owning persons travelling through Newport. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | Yes |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3811.K1 | Middleton, Dr Carolyn | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|---------|-----------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request that this site (Tredegar Park Caravan Site) be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Tredegar House is a 17th Century asset to Newport, set in beautiful grounds which is not suitable for a Gypsy / Traveller site. 2. This site brings in substantial revenue as part of Wales tourist attractions and should not be converted to a Gypsy / Traveller site. 3. Having recently agreed a 50 year lease from NCC to the National Trust for this site, surely it would be cost prohibitive to buy out this lease at this stage. 4. The caravan park should be retained for ALL in the caravanning community. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3839.K1 | Rokus, Ms Martina | | | 19/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Object to the alternative site suggested at Tredegar House.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)016

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Tredegar House Caravan Park

3 3 Representation

I have reviewed the new sites that have been proposed under the LDP for Newport.

I am appalled to see that Tredegar House has been put forward as a Gypsy Traveller site.

This park land and rural area is utilised by a number of local residents and visitors alike as a place for recreational activities, weddings and general visitors to the house itself.

In the past this area has been spoilt by travellers, e.g. household rubbish and human faeces, who have stayed there in an unofficial capacity.

As I stated in my previous email there was also an impact on the local housing estates with increased small thefts and petty crimes.

I would strongly object to having this beauty area utilised as an official site for travellers.

3849.K3 Suller, Cllr Tom

18/10/2013 E O M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Tredegar House Caravan Park

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)016

This proposal is already a flourishing site run by the Caravanning and Camping Club and should be rejected

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3861.K3 | Cassidian Limited | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Cassidian Limited objects to the proposal to change the current LDP allocation of this site from a Conservation Area and Special Landscape Area to Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation for the following reasons: Newport has an abundance of more suitable vacant sites closer to facilities and within defined settlement boundaries, without the necessity of re-designating a protected area. It is government policy, wherever possible, to regenerate City Centre sites in preference to abandonment of a protected area. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3932.K1 | Middleton, Mr Stephen | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request that this site (Tredegar Park Caravan Site) be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Tredegar House is a 17th Century asset to Newport, set in beautiful grounds which is not suitable for a Gypsy / Traveller site. 2. This site brings in substantial revenue as part of Wales tourist attractions and should not be converted to a Gypsy / Traveller site. 3. Having recently agreed a 50 year lease from NCC to the National Trust for this site, surely it would be cost prohibitive to buy out this lease at this stage. 4. The caravan park should be retained for ALL in the caravanning community. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3933.K1 | Middleton, Mr Richard | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request that this site (Tredegar Park Caravan Site) be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Tredegar House is a 17th Century asset to Newport, set in beautiful grounds which is not suitable for a Gypsy / Traveller site. 2. This site brings in substantial revenue as part of Wales tourist attractions and should not be converted to a Gypsy / Traveller site. 3. Having recently agreed a 50 year lease from NCC to the National Trust for this site, surely it would be cost prohibitive to buy out this lease at this stage. 4. The caravan park should be retained for ALL in the caravanning community. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3934.K1 | Middleton, Mr Gareth | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request that this site (Tredegar Park Caravan Site) be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Tredegar House is a 17th Century asset to Newport, set in beautiful grounds which is not suitable for a Gypsy / Traveller site. 2. This site brings in substantial revenue as part of Wales tourist attractions and should not be converted to a Gypsy / Traveller site. 3. Having recently agreed a 50 year lease from NCC to the National Trust for this site, surely it would be cost prohibitive to buy out this lease at this stage. 4. The caravan park should be retained for ALL in the caravanning community. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4046.K1 | Jensen, Mr George | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request that this site (Tredegar Park Caravan Site) be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Tredegar House is a 17th Century asset to Newport, set in beautiful grounds which is not suitable for a Gypsy / Traveller site. 2. This site brings in substantial revenue as part of Wales tourist attractions and should not be converted to a Gypsy / Traveller site. 3. Having recently agreed a 50 year lease from NCC to the National Trust for this site, surely it would be cost prohibitive to buy out this lease at this stage. 4. The caravan park should be retained for ALL in the caravanning community. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4047.K1 | Jensen, Mrs Iris | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|---------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|---------------------|--------|
|------|----------|---------------------|--------|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
|---|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
|---|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation | |
|---|---|----------------|--|

I request that this site (Tredegar Park Caravan Site) be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan.
My reasons are:

1. Tredegar House is a 17th Century asset to Newport, set in beautiful grounds which is not suitable for a Gypsy / Traveller site.
2. This site brings in substantial revenue as part of Wales tourist attractions and should not be converted to a Gypsy / Traveller site.
3. Having recently agreed a 50 year lease from NCC to the National Trust for this site, surely it would be cost prohibitive to buy out this lease at this stage.
4. The caravan park should be retained for ALL in the caravanning community.

| | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4048.K3 | Birchall, Professor James | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|---------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|---------------------|--------|
|------|----------|---------------------|--------|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
|---|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
|---|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation | |
|---|---|----------------|--|

The new sites proposed under part A as RAS(N)003, RAS(N)007, RAS(N)016 and RAS(N) 018 are clearly inappropriate. There is insufficient local resources (healthcare, education, retail) to accommodate gypsy traveller sites in this area. Situating such sites very close to fast-moving highways also represents a significant danger.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4065.K1 | Thomas, Ms Emily | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I am concerned that the above site considering it is put forward for deliberation, especially considering it is within the grounds of a National Trust property. I fail to see how a property such as Tredegar House would benefit from the addition of a traveller site. It is an Historical building with wonderful grounds which people visiting, whether they live in the area or not. Surely a traveller site on the doorstep would discourage visitors from returning? Also, as a new member of the community, I know I would not appreciate living in close proximity to such a site. If nothing else it would decrease the value of all properties in the area which could leave hundreds of homeowners in negative equity. This is not a prospect I relish having recently purchased a home in the vicinity. Had I been aware of these local 'development' plans I would have thought twice about buying in this location. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4073.K1 | Davies, R | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request that this site (Tredegar Park Caravan Site) be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Tredegar House is a 17th Century asset to Newport, set in beautiful grounds which is not suitable for a Gypsy / Traveller site. 2. This site brings in substantial revenue as part of Wales tourist attractions and should not be converted to a Gypsy / Traveller site. 3. Having recently agreed a 50 year lease from NCC to the National Trust for this site, surely it would be cost prohibitive to buy out this lease at this stage. 4. The caravan park should be retained for ALL in the caravanning community. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4074.K1 | Davies, Ms Marie | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)016 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar House Caravan Park | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request that this site (Tredegar Park Caravan Site) be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Tredegar House is a 17th Century asset to Newport, set in beautiful grounds which is not suitable for a Gypsy / Traveller site. 2. This site brings in substantial revenue as part of Wales tourist attractions and should not be converted to a Gypsy / Traveller site. 3. Having recently agreed a 50 year lease from NCC to the National Trust for this site, surely it would be cost prohibitive to buy out this lease at this stage. 4. The caravan park should be retained for ALL in the caravanning community. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4121.K3 | Bancroft, Mr & Mrs T | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |
|---------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Tredegar House Caravan Park

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation We oppose the inclusion of a gypsy and traveller site at Tredegar House Caravan Park. This site is a well used facility for private campers and tourists visiting the area, including the National Trust property at Tredegar House. We support the objections raised by Marshfield Community Council that conversion of this site to a gypsy and traveller site would (i) result in lost jobs for employees of the existing site, (ii) adversely affect the attraction of tourism to the local area and thereby result in lost revenue to the local area, (iii) increased traffic flow of commercial vehicles through National Trust parkland would pose an increased road safety risk to local members of the public and tourists. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4124.K3 | Lawrence, Shirley | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of Tredegar House Caravan Park as Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As per previous correspondence with NCC I request that the proposed Traveller Transit Site at Tredegar House Caravan Park be deleted from the LDP on the grounds that the area should remain a caravan park and be used by all caravan owning persons travelling through Newport.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

4128.K8 Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings

18/10/2013

E

C

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 528/ Tredegar House Caravan Park

Summary: Historic environment comments on Tredegar House Caravan Park.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)016

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Tredegar House Caravan Park

3 3 Representation

As well as being located within a conservation area, this site is partially located within a grade II* registered historic garden (PGW(Gt)48 - Tredegar Park) which is the garden to a grade I listed building (2902 - Tredegar House). Development could potentially have an adverse effect on the conservation area, registered garden and the setting of the listed building, though the existing use as a caravan park is noted.

Site,RepnType: 529/ McReady's,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1199.K4 | Giles, Cllr Gail | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 529/ McReady's

Summary: Supports proposed amendment of housing commitment boundary at McReady's

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I support applications RAS(A)014 - McReady's Ponthir Road - Amend Housing Commiment boundary to exclude Flood Zone C2.

Site,RepnType: 530/ Pentrepoeth,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 42.K4 | Graig Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 530/ Pentrepoeth

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of Special Landscape Area (SLA) boundary at Pentrepoeth

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

My Council strongly objects to any alterations being made to the following five sites in the Graig Ward (logged against each individual site).

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 694.K4 | Caston, Mr R J | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 530/ Pentrepoeth

Summary: Objects to proposal to remove site from Special Landscape Area

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)013 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Pentrepoeth (Redrow) | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I object to the proposal to remove this site from the Special Landscape Area. It is the entry to a large area of attractive countryside extending westwards and should be safeguarded as such. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 985.K1 | Raybould, Mr Allan | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |
|--------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 530/ Pentrepoeth

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)013 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Pentrepoeth | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We strongly support the Newport LDP and the current designation of this area as a Special Landscape Area and Countryside. We oppose the proposal to incorporate it within the urban area, thus potentially leaving it open for residential development. This area is part of the countryside separating Cardiff and Newport and we believe that high priority should be given to preserving this. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3276.K4 | and Family, Peter Symes | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 530/ Pentrepoeth

Summary: Object to proposed amendment at Pentrepoeth

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to all the proposed additions, amendments, and Deletions especially the proposed changes to the old Tredegar Park Golf course site.

I realise that the site owners will always have an eye for a chance to renege on their previously-agreed commitments but they have no firm grounds to wriggle out of these environmental conditions rightly imposed when planning permission was granted (unfortunately) in the first place.

Nothing has changed in the interim except there is an even greater need to protect the environment in Graig and ensure we have some green space and places to walk safely.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3399.K1 | Raybould, Ms Marilynne | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 530/ Pentrepoeth

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Pentrepoeth

3 3 Representation

We strongly support the Newport LDP and the current designation of this area as a Special Landscape Area and Countryside. We oppose the proposal to incorporate it within the urban area, thus potentially leaving it open for residential development. This area is part of the countryside separating Cardiff and Newport and we believe that high priority should be given to preserving this.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3467.K4 | Williams, Cllr David | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 530/ Pentrepoeth

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Pentrepoeth

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I wish to have the following comments added

- 1 Sufficient land is available now that the Alcan site is being developed.
- 2 The road infrastructure is inadequate for an increase in development in the ward
- 3 Bassaleg school is already full.
- 4 Forge lane and the Risca Bypass are already snarled up at peak times
- 5 The sites are within a special landscape area which needs to be preserved.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3683.K53 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 530/ Pentrepoeth

Summary: Objection to the proposed amendment of the Special Landscape Area boundary

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(A)013

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Pentrepoeth (Redrow)

3 3 Representation

There appears to be no evidence to support the proposed amendment to the Special Landscape Areas (SLA) boundary. As the LDP SLA boundaries are evidence based, we consider that the existing Revised Deposit LDP boundaries should be retained, and the proposed amendment not accepted.

Contrary to ToS
CE2

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| Site,RepnType: 531/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course, | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 42.K5 | Graig Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 531/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of cycleway at Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Also, my Council strongly objects to any alterations being made to the following five sites in the Graig Ward (logged against each of the 5 sites).

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 583.K4 | Cornelious, Cllr Mrs Margaret | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 531/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of long distance walk/cycleway at Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

It appears from the map that the exit from the walk/cycleway is to come out under the bridge through the flats at Golden Mile View. This is not a safe exit, as it is on a hill with busy traffic. There is no pavement on that side of Bassaleg Road, going towards Pye Corner under the Pye Corner Bridge.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 694.K5 | Caston, Mr R J | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 531/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objects to proposal to amend the route of the long-distance walk/cycleway

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)032

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

3 3 Representation

I object to the proposal to amend the route of the Long Distance Walk/Cycleway across this land. The previous route should be retained. It is much safer than alongside Forge Road. The land is of considerable beauty, and should be retained for public recreational use.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

3276.K5 and Family, Peter Symes

06/09/2013



E

M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 531/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Object to proposed amendment at Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to all the proposed additions, amendments, and Deletions especially the proposed changes to the old Tredegar Park Golf course site.

I realise that the site owners will always have an eye for a chance to renege on their previously-agreed commitments but they have no firm grounds to wriggle out of these environmental conditions rightly imposed when planning permission was granted (unfortunately) in the first place.

Nothing has changed in the interim except there is an even greater need to protect the environment in Graig and ensure we have some green space and places to walk safely.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K26 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 531/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: The exact route is part of the negotiation

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(A)032 Former Tredegar Park Golf Course Bassaleg

This footway/cycleway is part on-going discussion relating to a Section 106 Agreement for an approved residential development on the former golf course. The exact route is part of the negotiation.

Site,RepnType: 532/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 42.K6 | Graig Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 532/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of SLA at Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Also, my Council strongly objects to any alterations being made to the following five sites in the Graig Ward (logged against each of the 5 sites).

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 583.K3 | Cornelious, Cllr Mrs Margaret | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 532/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of the SLA boundary at Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

This area has been used as golf course/parkland by people to enjoy for many years. If this area is no longer a special landscape area it is likely to be vulnerable to development for housing. Newport already has more land designated for development than is legally requested. Brownfield land such as the near by Novelis site should be used just before destroying beautiful parkland.

4 4

Additional Material

No

5 5

Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 694.K6 | Caston, Mr R J | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 532/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objects to proposal to remove this site from the Special Landscape Area

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)034

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

3 3 Representation
I object to the proposal to remove this site from the Special Landscape Area. Its avenue of trees along the public right-of-way, and the embankment of the former tramway, with it's river bridhe, are well worthy of preservation. The land is of considerable beauty, and should be retained for public recreational use.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

3276.K6 and Family, Peter Symes

06/09/2013 E M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 532/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Object to proposed amendment at Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to all the proposed additions, amendments, and Deletions especially the proposed changes to the old Tredegar Park Golf course site.

I realise that the site owners will always have an eye for a chance to renege on their previously-agreed commitments but they have no firm grounds to wriggle out of these environmental conditions rightly imposed when planning permission was granted (unfortunately) in the first place.

Nothing has changed in the interim except there is an even greater need to protect the environment in Graig and ensure we have some green space and places to walk safely.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K54 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 532/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of Special Landscape Area boundary

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)034 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Tredegar Park Golf Course | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed amendment to boundary of area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA* There appears to be no evidence base to support the proposed amendment to the SLA boundary. As the LDP SLA boundaries are evidence based, we consider that the existing boundaries should be retained, and the proposed amendment not accepted. Contrary to ToS P2, C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional comments and hyperlink) | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| | | *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4128.K4 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 532/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Historic Environment Comments on Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)034

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

3 3 Representation

This site includes a grade II listed structure (3075 - Footbridge at Tredegar Park Golf Course). The structure is a former tramroad bridge which crossed the deer park of the Tredegar estate. Whilst the landscape is altered, it still forms an important part of the setting of this listed building and the wider historic setting of grade I listed Tredegar House. Development is likely to adversely affect the setting of these listed buildings.

Site,RepnType: 533/ Land North of A48,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1395.K8 | Atwell, Cllr David | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 533/ Land North of A48

Summary: Supports proposed Special Landscape Area designation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)003 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land North of A48 | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(A)003 - Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site) I strongly support the proposed alternative use fro this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Would like to speak on all sites from attached list that are included in LDP should comment be ignored. | Yes |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1396.K8 | Atwell, Mrs Carole | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |
|---------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 533/ Land North of A48

Summary: Supports proposed Special Landscape Area designation

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)003 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land North of A48 | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(A)003 - Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site) I strongly support the proposed alternative use fro this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3042.K10 | Anderton, Mr Paul | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 533/ Land North of A48

Summary: Support of proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land North A48, Langstone

3 3 Representation
I support all 3 of the proposed revisions for the reasons given by the Representatives.

3683.K55 Natural Resources Wales

18/10/2013 E O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 533/ Land North of A48

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment to Special Landscape Area boundary

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land North A48, Langstone

3 3 Representation
There appears to be no evidence to support the proposed amendment to the Special Landscape Areas (SLA) boundary. As the LDP SLA boundaries are evidence based, we consider that the existing Revised Deposit LDP boundaries should be retained, and the proposed amendment not accepted.

Contrary to ToS CE2

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3699.K10 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 533/ Land North of A48

Summary: Supports proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land North of A48

3 3 Representation
I support all 3 of the proposed revisions for the reasons given by the Representatives.

3738.K8 John, Major (Retd) W M

15/10/2013 P S M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 533/ Land North of A48

Summary: Supports the extension to the Langstone SLA.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land north of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court)

3 3 Representation
I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3814.K6 | Saunders, Peter & Teresa | | | 13/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 533/ Land North of A48

Summary: Support the proposal to extend the SLA near Langstone.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land north of A48

3 3 Representation
RAS(A)003: Land North of A48, including Oak Court/Gorelands site
In view of the erosion of the countryside on the fringes of the city we strongly support the use of this site as a Special Landscaped Area and recommend its inclusion in the Local Development Plan.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3994.K8 | Watkins, Sharne | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 533/ Land North of A48

Summary: Supports the proposed designation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land North of A48

3 3 Representation
RAS(A)003 - Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site)
I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4127.K8 | Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher & | | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 533/ Land North of A48

Summary: Support the suggested extension to the SLA at Langstone

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site).

3 3 Representation
I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

Site,RepnType: 534/ North East Coldra,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1395.K9 | Atwell, Cllr David | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |
|---------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
North East Coldra

3 3 Representation
RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra
The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

4 4 Additional Material Yes

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes
Would like to speak on all sites from the attached list that are included in LDP should comment be ignored.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1396.K9 | Atwell, Mrs Carole | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Objection to proposed development

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)011 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name North East Coldra | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3039.K8 | Cabrera, Mr Jose | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|---------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of the settlement boundary at North East Coldra

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|---|--------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained. | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3042.K11 | Anderton, Mr Paul | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Support of proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
North East Coldra

3 3 Representation
I support all 3 of the proposed revisions for the reasons given by the Representatives.

The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K56 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Recommendation that existing settlement boundary be maintained

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)011 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name North East Coldra |
| 3 | 3 | Representation North East Coldra Proposed amendment to settlement boundary in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as Open Countryside (Greenfield) site linked to proposed new mixed use alternative site. Recommend existing boundary is maintained. * EPS – Records of dormice adjacent to the site^ Contrary to ToS P2, C2, CE1, CE2 (See additional comments and hyperlink) |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material *For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken. ^For sites with known potential for EPS: The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP. We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range. We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3699.K11 | Anderton, Bernadette | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|-----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Supports proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
North East Coldra

3 3 Representation
I support all 3 of the proposed revisions for the reasons given by the Representors.

The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3738.K9 | John, Major (Retd) W M | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Object to the alternative site at North East Coldra

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
North East Coldra

3 3 Representation
The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has hghway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3779.K9 | Horleston, Mr Peter G | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
North East Coldra

3 3 Representation
RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra
The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3795.K9 | Horleston, Bronwen A | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
North East Coldra

3 3 Representation
RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra
The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3994.K9 | Watkins, Sharne | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Objection to proposed development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(N)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
North East Coldra

3 3 Representation
RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra
The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

4127.K9 Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher &

21/10/2013 P C M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 534/ North East Coldra

Summary: Object to the suggested site at Coldra.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)011

2 2 Alternative Site Name
North East Coldra

3 3 Representation
The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preferences is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

Site,RepnType: 535/ Land adj Llanvaches Church,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3042.K12 | Anderton, Mr Paul | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 535/ Land adj Llanvaches Church

Summary: Support of proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent Llanvaches Church

3 3 Representation
I support all 3 of the proposed revisions for the reasons given by the Representatives.

3699.K12 Anderton, Bernadette

02/10/2013 E S M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 535/ Land adj Llanvaches Church

Summary: Supports proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Llanvaches Church

3 3 Representation
I support all 3 of the proposed revisions for the reasons given by the Representatives.

Site,RepnType: 536/ Redwick Village,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K57 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 536/ Redwick Village

Summary: Comments regarding SSSI status, SLA/greenfield site and apparent lack of evidence to support proposed amendment to SLA boundary

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(A)001

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Redwick Village

3 3 Representation

Proposed amendment to settlement boundary within SSSI and in area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA/Open Countryside (Greenfield) site *

The land proposed for inclusion within settlement boundary is also within the Gwent Levels – Redwick and Llandeenny SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of the special interest. It also has potential adverse implications for the management of the SSSI. We would therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest. #

There appears to be no evidence base to support the proposed amendment to the SLA boundary. As the LDP SLA boundaries are evidence based, we consider that the existing boundaries should be retained, and the proposed amendment not accepted.

Contrary to ToS P2, C2, CE1, CE2

(See additional comments and hyperlink)

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|---|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | Yes | | | | | |
| <p>*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land. If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.</p> <p># For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2, This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.</p> <p>We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.</p> <p>In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | No | | | | | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3995.K1 | Williams, Mr Nigel H | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 536/ Redwick Village

Summary: Object to the suggested site at Green Court, Redwick Village.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)001

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Redwick Village

3 3 Representation

I have looked at the proposed amendment to the Local Development Plan which seeks to bring our property (Green Court Redwick - hatched orange) within the village boundary (red line). Our understanding was that Green Court was already within the village boundary and the road running 30 meters or so to our East marked the village boundary and also the extent of the Local Development zone. So, we are puzzled by this latest plan which shows the red lined Village Boundary running to the West of our property between Green Court and Springfield and wonder why this amendment is necessary and on whose behalf it is being made. There would not appear to be any mention of the name/address of the Representor nor any explanation as to why this (unnecessary) change is being requested.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 537/ North South Link Road,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K27 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 537/ North South Link Road

Summary: Object to the reallocation to footway/cycleway only

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(A)002 North/South link Llanwern

The north/south link is required to connect the Llanwern Steelworks regeneration site and the Llanwern Village expansion site in terms of public transport provision and will give access to the proposed Railway Station to the south of the Great Western rail line. A vehicular bridge capable of accommodating two way traffic flows including busses is essential. I would oppose this reallocation to footway/cycleway only.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| Site,RepnType: 538/ Woodlands Site, | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3507.K7 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 538/ Woodlands Site

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of housing proposal at Woodlands Site, Ringland

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We do not support this, all land should be included. Any site specific constraints should be considered at detail design. We would like it noted that this site is deliverable within the plan period.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3683.K58 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 538/ Woodlands Site

Summary: Support for proposal to remove area of woodland from the boundary of the allocation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(A)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Llanwern Village

3 3 Representation

We welcome the proposal to remove the area of woodland from the boundary of the allocation. We consider that this amendment is consistent with Objective 6 of the Revised LDP to protect and enhance the natural environment.

Proposal would be consistent with ToS CE1

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Site,RepnType: 539/ Land at Bishton Village,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4128.K7 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 539/ Land at Bishton Village

Summary: Built environment comments on land at Bishton Village

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)010 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Bishton Village |
| 3 | 3 | Representation This site includes a grade II listed building (2907 - Parish Church of St. Cadwalader). Development may have an adverse effect on the setting of this building. |

Site,RepnType: 540/ Llanwern Village,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 28.K1 | Newbridge Construction Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 540/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development to expand Eastern Expansion Area

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)018 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Llanwern Village |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)018 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)018 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area. It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Furthermore, the proposed sites would effectively increase the size of the Eastern Expansion Area by a third and significantly contribute towards coalescence with Newport City. Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather consideration should be given at locations where people want to live. In this regard it is considered that the capacity of site H1 (12) – Former Tredegar Park Golf Course should be increased to 200 dwellings to allow a more efficient use of the land and to contribute deliverable housing towards the required need. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 321.K1 | Newbridge Ests & John Fmly | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 540/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed expansion of Eastern Expansion for residential development

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)018 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Llanwern Village |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)018 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)018 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area. It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Furthermore, the proposed sites would effectively increase the size of the Eastern Expansion Area by a third and significantly contribute towards coalescence with Newport City. Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (RAS(N)030) is a highly suitable alternative it: <input type="checkbox"/> Immediately adjoins the settlement of Rhiwderin; <input type="checkbox"/> Is in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport and is a sustainable location; <input type="checkbox"/> readily links into the existing highways network; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 357.K13 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 540/ Llanwern Village

Summary: The developers are aware of Welsh Water's position

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

We have been consulted with respect to the above site and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to this site and once matters have progressed we will look to work with your authority to ensure that appropriate conditions will be included within any planning consents.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1117.K1 | Herbert, Richard | Boyer Planning | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 540/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Object to proposed expansion of Eastern Expansion Area for residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Llanwern Village

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)018 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and
- CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)018 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area.

It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Furthermore, the proposed sites would effectively increase the size of the Eastern Expansion Area by a third and significantly contribute towards coalescence with Newport City.

Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.

The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Llwynhaid, Bettws (RASN031) is a highly suitable alternative it:

- Sits immediately adjoining the settlement boundary;
- The site is visually and physically well contained;
- is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services;
- is well served by public transport;
- has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | Yes | | | | | |

1418.K1 Pontymister Dev Ltd Boyer Planning - Cardiff 18/10/2013 E O I M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 540/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development to expand Eastern Expansion Area

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Llanwern Village

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)018 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and
- CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)018 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area.

It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Furthermore, the proposed sites would effectively increase the size of the Eastern Expansion Area by a third and significantly contribute towards coalescence with Newport City.

Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.

The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Risca Road, Rogerstone (RAS(N025) is a highly suitable alternative it:

- Sits immediately adjoining the settlement boundary and would be integrated with the existing pattern of built development;
- is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services;
- is well served by public transport;
- has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1666.K1 | Murray, Mrs H E | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 540/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed expansion of housing commitment at Llanwern village.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)018

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Llanwern village

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)018 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and
- CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)018 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area.

It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Furthermore, the proposed sites would effectively increase the size of the Eastern Expansion Area by a third and significantly contribute towards coalescence with Newport City.

Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.

The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at The Griffin, Bassaleg (RAS(N)024) is a highly suitable alternative it:

- would be integrated with the existing pattern of built development;
- provide a mixed use scheme comprising of residential and leisure/educational development;
- is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services;
- has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2072.K1 | Newbridge Estates Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 540/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development to expand Eastern Expansion Area

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)018 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Llanwern Village |
| 3 | 3 | Representation <p>We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)018 being unsound in terms of the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. <p>The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)018 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area. It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Furthermore, the proposed sites would effectively increase the size of the Eastern Expansion Area by a third and significantly contribute towards coalescence with Newport City.</p> <p>Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.</p> <p>The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (RAS(N)030) is a highly suitable alternative it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Immediately adjoins the settlement of Rhiwderin; <input type="checkbox"/> Is in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport and is a sustainable location; <input type="checkbox"/> readily links into the existing highways network; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K59 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Additional material submitted

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 540/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Bats are present at this location; therefore, any planning application would require a species survey

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)018 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Llanwern Village | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Our records indicate that bats, a European protected species, are present at the site. We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species ^ | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material ^For sites with known potential for EPS: The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP. We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range. We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Site,RepnType: 542/ Llanwern Village,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 28.K3 | Newbridge Construction Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 542/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development to expand Eastern Expansion Area

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)028 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Llanwern Village |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)028 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)028 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area. It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Furthermore, the proposed sites would effectively increase the size of the Eastern Expansion Area by a third and significantly contribute towards coalescence with Newport City. Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather consideration should be given at locations where people want to live. In this regard it is considered that the capacity of site H1 (12) – Former Tredegar Park Golf Course should be increased to 200 dwellings to allow a more efficient use of the land and to contribute deliverable housing towards the required need. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 321.K3 | Newbridge Ests & John Fmly | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 542/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land as residential development to expand Eastern Expansion Area

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)028 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Llanwern Village |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)028 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)028 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area. It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (RAS(N)030) is a highly suitable alternative it: <input type="checkbox"/> Immediately adjoins the settlement of Rhiwderin; <input type="checkbox"/> Is in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport and is a sustainable location; <input type="checkbox"/> readily links into the existing highways network; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 357.K14 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 542/ Llanwern Village

Summary: The developers are aware of Welsh Water's position

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

We have been consulted with respect to the above site and have provided our comments accordingly. The developers are aware of our position with respect to this site and once matters have progressed we will look to work with your authority to ensure that appropriate conditions will be included within any planning consents.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1117.K3 | Herbert, Richard | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 542/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed expansion of Eastern Expansion Area for residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)028

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Llanwern Village

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)028 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and
- CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)028 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area.

It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.

The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Llwynhaid, Bettws (RASN031) is a highly suitable alternative it:

- Sits immediately adjoining the settlement boundary;
- The site is visually and physically well contained;
- is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services;
- is well served by public transport;
- has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1418.K3 | Pontymister Dev Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 542/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development to expand Eastern Expansion Area

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)028 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Llanwern Village |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)028 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)028 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area. It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Risca Road, Rogerstone (RAS(N025) is a highly suitable alternative it: <input type="checkbox"/> Sits immediately adjoining the settlement boundary and would be integrated with the existing pattern of built development; <input type="checkbox"/> is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services; <input type="checkbox"/> is well served by public transport; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1666.K3 | Murray, Mrs H E | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 542/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed expansion of housing commitment at Llanwern village

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)028

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Llanwern village

3 3 Representation

We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)028 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and
- CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)028 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area.

It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.

The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at The Griffin, Bassaleg (RAS(N)024) is a highly suitable alternative it:

- would be integrated with the existing pattern of built development;
- provide a mixed use scheme comprising of residential and leisure/educational development;
- is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services;
- has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2072.K3 | Newbridge Estates Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 542/ Llanwern Village

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for residential development to expand Eastern Expansion Area

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)028 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Llanwern Village |
| 3 | 3 | Representation We object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)028 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)028 seeks an increase to the allocation of land at Llanwern, Village for residential development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area. It is evident that the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, it is proposed that the site forms part of the Eastern Expansion Area, however we consider that there is sufficient development allocated within the surrounding area. Given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (RAS(N)030) is a highly suitable alternative it: <input type="checkbox"/> Immediately adjoins the settlement of Rhiwderin; <input type="checkbox"/> Is in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport and is a sustainable location; <input type="checkbox"/> readily links into the existing highways network; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K28 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 542/ Llanwern Village

Summary: No objection providing the access being provided from within the expansion site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(A)028 Llanwern Village

The site is located too close the Cot Hill/SDR junction to safely provide an alternative access into the Llanwern Village Expansion area. However, I would not oppose this proposal subject to access being provided from within the expansion site.

Site,RepnType: 543/ Newport Retail Park,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------------|-----------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1237.K4 | Wm Morrison Supermrkts | Peacock & Smith | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |
|---------|------------------------|-----------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 543/ Newport Retail Park

Summary: Additional support for the proposed designation of Newport Retail Park as an Out of Centre Retail Park

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Site RAS(A)012

Accordingly, our client strongly supports the designation of Newport Retail Park as an out-of-centre retail park. This shopping park provides a traditional out-of-centre retail park format with large amounts of car parking and stores with large footprints.

As such, the retail park should be redefined as an out-of-centre retail park, as proposed by amended site RAS(A)012, whereby the retail policy tests of Planning Policy Wales, relating to need, impact and sequential test, can apply to further protect the vitality and viability of Newport City Centre.

I trust that the above is helpful and I would be grateful if you could ensure that Peacock and Smith remain on the consultation database on behalf of Morrisons to be informed of the outcome of this consultation stage.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 544/ Solutia,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3993.K1 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 544/ Solutia

Summary: Agree with suggested changes to Solutia.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)021

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Solutia

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 545/ Newport Retail Park,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1237.K1 | Wm Morrison Supermrkts | Peacock & Smith | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 545/ Newport Retail Park

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of the Newport Retail Park boundary

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Sites RAS(A)022, RAS(A)035 and RAS(A)036

Our client strongly objects to the amended District Centre boundary to include land adjacent to Newport Retail Park.

We do not consider that this retail park or surrounding uses, which have been suggested to be included within the boundary, meet the characteristics of a District Centre.

Newport Retail Park provides a range of comparison shopping facilities, along with a large Tesco Extra supermarket. The site provides hundreds of free car parking spaces and is intended predominantly for car-borne shoppers.

TAN4 defines a District Centre as being:

"Groups of shops, separate from the town centre, usually containing at least one food supermarket or superstore and non-retail services such as banks, building societies and restaurants".

The stores at Newport Retail Park include a PC World, Next, Asda Living, Outfit (incorporating Burton, Miss Selfridge, Wallis, Evans, Principles, Warehouse and Dorothy Perkins) and Sports Direct. These shops do not offer the type of goods which people require on a day-to-day basis. The retail park does not include the types of facility that would normally be expected to meet local shopping needs, such as a post office, bank/building society or florist.

In addition to not offering the types of facilities and services that we would normally expect in a District Centre, we also consider that the retail park has already expanded beyond what is appropriate for a District Centre. We note from the Council's District Centres Background Paper (June 2013) that the gross retail floorspace at the Retail Park is 32,246 sq.m. This is equivalent to about 73% of the Newport City Centre.

Paragraph 8.21 of the Revised Deposit Plan states that further development of the District Centre will pose a threat to the viability and vitality of the City Centre. We note that Policy R6 of the April 2012 Deposit Plan sought to restrict additional sales floorspace at the retail park. Our previous representations stated that we considered this policy approach, to restrict retail floorspace within a District Centre, to be fundamentally unsound and that accordingly the District Centre status should be removed and all facilities considered as being out-of-centre.

Accordingly, we consider that the designation of Newport Retail Park, and the suggested amendment to the boundary of the District Centre are fundamentally unsound and fail the C1, C2 and CE2 tests of soundness for the following reasons:

- The designation of the retail park as a District Centre does not have regard to other strategies relating to the protection of the vitality and viability of the city centre.
- The designation of the retail park as a District Centre does not have regard to the definition of District Centres provided in TAN4.
- The District Centre allocation and Policy R7 are not realistic or appropriate for the reasons given above.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3507.K8 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 545/ Newport Retail Park

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of District Centre boundary at Newport Retail Park

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

We do not support this as any further expansion will threaten the City Centre which is the Councils priority.

Site,RepnType: 546/ Land adj Newport Retail Park,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1237.K2 | Wm Morrison Supermrkts | Peacock & Smith | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 546/ Land adj Newport Retail Park

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of Newport Retail Park boundary

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Sites RAS(A)022, RAS(A)035 and RAS(A)036

Our client strongly objects to the amended District Centre boundary to include land adjacent to Newport Retail Park.

We do not consider that this retail park or surrounding uses, which have been suggested to be included within the boundary, meet the characteristics of a District Centre.

Newport Retail Park provides a range of comparison shopping facilities, along with a large Tesco Extra supermarket. The site provides hundreds of free car parking spaces and is intended predominantly for car-borne shoppers.

TAN4 defines a District Centre as being:

"Groups of shops, separate from the town centre, usually containing at least one food supermarket or superstore and non-retail services such as banks, building societies and restaurants".

The stores at Newport Retail Park include a PC World, Next, Asda Living, Outfit (incorporating Burton, Miss Selfridge, Wallis, Evans, Principles, Warehouse and Dorothy Perkins) and Sports Direct. These shops do not offer the type of goods which people require on a day-to-day basis. The retail park does not include the types of facility that would normally be expected to meet local shopping needs, such as a post office, bank/building society or florist.

In addition to not offering the types of facilities and services that we would normally expect in a District Centre, we also consider that the retail park has already expanded beyond what is appropriate for a District Centre. We note from the Council's District Centres Background Paper (June 2013) that the gross retail floorspace at the Retail Park is 32,246 sq.m. This is equivalent to about 73% of the Newport City Centre.

Paragraph 8.21 of the Revised Deposit Plan states that further development of the District Centre will pose a threat to the viability and vitality of the City Centre. We note that Policy R6 of the April 2012 Deposit Plan sought to restrict additional sales floorspace at the retail park. Our previous representations stated that we considered this policy approach, to restrict retail floorspace within a District Centre, to be fundamentally unsound and that accordingly the District Centre status should be removed and all facilities considered as being out-of-centre.

Accordingly, we consider that the designation of Newport Retail Park, and the suggested amendment to the boundary of the District Centre are fundamentally unsound and fail the C1, C2 and CE2 tests of soundness for the following reasons:

- The designation of the retail park as a District Centre does not have regard to other strategies relating to the protection of the vitality and viability of the city centre.
- The designation of the retail park as a District Centre does not have regard to the definition of District Centres provided in TAN4.
- The District Centre allocation and Policy R7 are not realistic or appropriate for the reasons given above.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3507.K9 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 546/ Land adj Newport Retail Park

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of District Centre boundary at Newport Retail Park

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

We do not support this as any further expansion will threaten the City Centre which is the Councils priority.

Site,RepnType: 547/ Land adj Newport Retail Park,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1237.K3 | Wm Morrison Supermrkts | Peacock & Smith | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 547/ Land adj Newport Retail Park

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of Newport Retail Park boundary

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Sites RAS(A)022, RAS(A)035 and RAS(A)036

Our client strongly objects to the amended District Centre boundary to include land adjacent to Newport Retail Park.

We do not consider that this retail park or surrounding uses, which have been suggested to be included within the boundary, meet the characteristics of a District Centre.

Newport Retail Park provides a range of comparison shopping facilities, along with a large Tesco Extra supermarket. The site provides hundreds of free car parking spaces and is intended predominantly for car-borne shoppers.

TAN4 defines a District Centre as being:

"Groups of shops, separate from the town centre, usually containing at least one food supermarket or superstore and non-retail services such as banks, building societies and restaurants".

The stores at Newport Retail Park include a PC World, Next, Asda Living, Outfit (incorporating Burton, Miss Selfridge, Wallis, Evans, Principles, Warehouse and Dorothy Perkins) and Sports Direct. These shops do not offer the type of goods which people require on a day-to-day basis. The retail park does not include the types of facility that would normally be expected to meet local shopping needs, such as a post office, bank/building society or florist.

In addition to not offering the types of facilities and services that we would normally expect in a District Centre, we also consider that the retail park has already expanded beyond what is appropriate for a District Centre. We note from the Council's District Centres Background Paper (June 2013) that the gross retail floorspace at the Retail Park is 32,246 sq.m. This is equivalent to about 73% of the Newport City Centre.

Paragraph 8.21 of the Revised Deposit Plan states that further development of the District Centre will pose a threat to the viability and vitality of the City Centre. We note that Policy R6 of the April 2012 Deposit Plan sought to restrict additional sales floorspace at the retail park. Our previous representations stated that we considered this policy approach, to restrict retail floorspace within a District Centre, to be fundamentally unsound and that accordingly the District Centre status should be removed and all facilities considered as being out-of-centre.

Accordingly, we consider that the designation of Newport Retail Park, and the suggested amendment to the boundary of the District Centre are fundamentally unsound and fail the C1, C2 and CE2 tests of soundness for the following reasons:

- The designation of the retail park as a District Centre does not have regard to other strategies relating to the protection of the vitality and viability of the city centre.
- The designation of the retail park as a District Centre does not have regard to the definition of District Centres provided in TAN4.
- The District Centre allocation and Policy R7 are not realistic or appropriate for the reasons given above.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3507.K10 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 547/ Land adj Newport Retail Park

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of District Centre boundary at Newport Retail Park

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

We do not support this as any further expansion will threaten the City Centre which is the Councils priority.

Site,RepnType: 548/ Sneyd Lodge,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K60 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 548/ Sneyd Lodge

Summary: Objection to the proposed amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Sneyd Lodge

There appears to be no evidence to support the proposed amendment to the Environmental Space boundary. We therefore consider that the existing Revised Deposit LDP boundaries should be retained, and the proposed amendment not accepted.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.

Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

Site,RepnType: 549/ Sneyd Lodge,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K61 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 549/ Sneyd Lodge

Summary: Objection to the proposed amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Sneyd Lodge

There appears to be no evidence to support the proposed amendment to the Environmental Space boundary. We therefore consider that the existing Revised Deposit LDP boundaries should be retained, and the proposed amendment not accepted.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.

Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

Site,RepnType: 550/ Malpas Road District Centre,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 224.K1 | Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd | White Young Green | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 550/ Malpas Road District Centre

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)024

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Malpas Road District Centre

3 3 Representation

SSL object to the extension of the allocated Malpas Road District Centre to include Discovery Retail Park (Alternative Site Reference RAS(A)024). The objection is on the grounds that the expansion would more than double the size of the existing designated centre to include two additional retail units comprising Wickes and an Aldi store, which would fundamentally change the status of the designated centre.

The Discovery Retail Park is mainly accessed by car-borne visitors and is physically separated from Malpas Road District Centre by the layout of the Discovery Retail Park and surrounding highways. The locality offers inadequate pedestrian and cycle linkages within and between the existing and proposed elements of the proposed district centre and as such that they would not function together as a cohesive whole.

Paragraph 8.17 of the Revised Development Plan highlights that 'Newport's District Centres vary in size, but are predominantly linear concentrations of commercial and shop premises along main roads leading in and out of the City'. The existing allocated centre provides a clear example of this description offering a range of top-up convenience shops, hot-food takeaways, hairdressers, betting shops and estate agents of a scale appropriate to the particular centre and the surrounding population. The Discovery Retail Park units are not of an appropriate scale to the district centre and their inclusion within the designation would not protect or enhance the vitality, viability and attractiveness of the existing allocated centre. Allocation could lead to further "in centre" retail development at the Discovery Retail Park which would potentially damage vitality and viability of the City Centre and the District Centre.

We note that no Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out for this proposed allocation.

Accordingly, the proposed allocation and doubling in size of the district centre is not supported by the evidence base of the LDP and consequently should be resisted.

Site,RepnType: 551/ Duffryn Employment Site,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1600.K19 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 551/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|---|-----------------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)008 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Duffryn Employment Site |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I object to the removal of the Duffryn Employment Site from the designation as a "site of interest for nature conservation" and "site of special scientific interest" because I believe that if the site loses these designations it will not place enough emphasis on future development proposals to have regard for any features covered by these designations which may be on the land. I do not object to the development of the land but would like to ensure that any nature conservation or SSSI concerns are addressed adequately. |
| <p>The designation on this land should remain to protect any features of importance if it is eventually developed as employment land.</p> | | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K62 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 551/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Support the proposal to exclude the areas of SINC and SSSI

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Duffryn Employment Site

We welcome and support the proposal to exclude the areas of SINC and SSSI from the land allocated for employment purposes. We consider that this proposed amendment is consistent with your duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (as amended) and with Objective 6 of the revised LDP to protect and enhance the natural environment, and national planning policy.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.

Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 3849.K11 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | M |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 551/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment at Duffryn Employment Site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

RAS(A)008

The designation on this land should remain to protect any features of importance if it is eventually developed as employment land.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4048.K5 | Birchall, Professor James | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 551/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Duffryn Employment Site

3 3 Representation

I also disagree with the proposal to change designation of employment land under RAS(A)008. This area should be used to enhance employment opportunities for existing residents.

Site,RepnType: 552/ Graig Y Saeson,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1600.K11 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 552/ Graig Y Saeson

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)019

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Graig Y Saeson

3 3 Representation
RAS(A)019 & RAS(A)033

This area of land is highly visible and of some importance which was recognised by it's designation as an SLA. The designation should remain as nothing has changed.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K63 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 552/ Graig Y Saeson

Summary: Objection to proposed boundary amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Graig Y Saeson

Proposed amendment to boundary of area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA linked to proposed new housing alternative site. See comments on AS(N) 004 above.

Recommend existing boundary is maintained.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.

Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 3849.K12 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | M |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 552/ Graig Y Saeson

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment at Graig Y Saeson

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

RAS(A)019 & RAS(A)033

This area of land is highly visible and of some importance which was recognised by it's designation as an SLA. The designation should remain as nothing has changed.

Site,RepnType: 553/ Celtic Springs,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 357.K15 | Dwr Cymru Welsh Water | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 553/ Celtic Springs

Summary: Depending on the proposed housing density, no problems are envisaged as a result of proposed residential development

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

A water supply can be provided to service this proposed site. Depending on the proposed housing density no problems are envisaged with the public sewerage system for domestic foul discharge or at the receiving Cardiff Bay Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the domestic flows from the proposed site.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1420.K4 | Corus UK Ltd / Tata Steel UK Ltd | Turley Associates | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 553/ Celtic Springs

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development at Celtic Springs

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

We write in relation to the Alternative Sites Register (Revised Deposit Stage) published for consultation in September 2013. This submission is made on behalf of our clients in relation to Alternative Site Ref: RAS(A)029, Celtic Springs.

Alternative Site RAS(A)029 is identified as a 'proposed amendment by Representors to existing Revised LDP allocations' in Part B of the Alternative Site Schedule. The site is currently identified in Policy EM1 (iii) of the Revised Deposit as a major employment land allocation. The policy proposes a 6.1 ha extension of the existing Celtic Springs Business Park (primarily for B1 business uses). The proposed amendment seeks the deletion of the existing employment allocation under Policy EM1 (iii), with the site being reallocated as a residential led mixed use development. Our clients object to the proposed amendment to Policy EM1 (iii) for the reasons set out below.

Our comments are based on the information available via the Alternative Sites Register and the Register of Revised Deposit Local Development Plan (LDP) Representations. This information does not indicate what the proposed mix of uses would be, beyond stating that the development would be residential led. The Register of Revised Deposit LDP Representations states that the representor wishes to appear at the hearing sessions to "discuss the context and reasons for seeking the deletion of the remaining land at Celtic Springs from Policy EM1". At this stage, our comments therefore focus on the principle of deleting the existing allocation and replacing it with a residential led mixed use development. Reference to the Register of Revised Deposit LDP Representations suggests that the proposed amendment has been put forward on the basis of there being an "over provision of employment land" in the emerging LDP. The representor therefore argues that land at Celtic Springs should be allocated as a regeneration opportunity, including residential. Employment land provision, and the specific question of whether too much land was being promoted through the LDP, was assessed as part of the Employment Land Review (ELR) (March 2013). The study seeks to provide additional market based justification for the proposed new land supply, whilst also seeking to reduce any potential oversupply (from the Deposit Plan). This review forms part of the evidence base supporting the LDP.

The ELR made a series of recommended changes to the Deposit Plan employment policies. These included reducing the amount of land promoted in the plan to reflect concerns from, inter alia, the Welsh Government. It was recommended that the amount of land promoted through the LDP was reduced in a number of different ways. This was subsequently reflected in the Revised Deposit Plan.

We do not wish to comment in detail on the suggested overprovision of employment land as this has been addressed by the ELR. It is clear, however, that the ELR concluded that no changes should be made to the proposed allocation of land at Celtic Springs under Policy EM1 (iii) to address any perceived oversupply of land. This has rightly been reflected in the Revised Deposit. The ELR states that the allocated land at Celtic Springs is located within a high quality business park that benefits from good access, is well occupied and has high demand. The review notes that the Business Park "provides a range of modern units, offering flexible space and headquarter buildings." It concludes that the Business Park "provides a number of contemporary and high quality campus office buildings offering prestigious accommodation aimed at local and regional companies". The individual assessment of the site (Appendix 1 of the ELR) also notes that "the land allocated under EM1 (iii) will be attractive in the shorter term in terms of quantitative and qualitative need". The ELR therefore clearly perceives Celtic Springs, and its proposed expansion, as an important employment location.

The Revised Deposit makes it clear that the allocation at Celtic Springs (alongside the City Centre) forms a key part of the overall strategy for delivering future office development in Newport. This is particularly important given that the ELR concludes that there is a limited supply of "modern, Grade A office accommodation" and an oversupply of second hand accommodation relative to demand. As such, the supply of new sites for office development, including sufficient new greenfield sites, is essential. The land allocated at Celtic Springs provides the opportunity to deliver modern, flexible and high quality office space as and when the market allows. The continued allocation of land at Celtic Springs under Policy EM1 (iii) is therefore a vital part of the overall LDP employment strategy.

Our clients believe that the allocation of the site as a mixed use development would weaken the prominence of the business park and could deter future investment from new occupiers, or equally existing uses looking to expand. Celtic Springs is recognised as a prestige business park, which benefits from excellent strategic connections and has attracted a number of high profile tenants including EADS, the Ministry of Justice and Wales and West Utilities. Our clients are concerned that the deletion of the employment allocation and the introduction of non-employment generating uses could have a negative effect on existing occupiers and the continued letting of the Business Park. The introduction of residential uses at the Business Park would dilute its overall position as a prestige business park and limit opportunities for future expansion.

Regardless of any argument as to whether there is still an overprovision of employment land in the LDP, our clients strongly believe that the site at Celtic Springs should remain allocated for employment use under Policy EM1 (iii). Only those sites that are not deliverable or required for future employment uses as part of the overall LDP strategy should be deleted or reallocated. Land at Celtic Springs is clearly an important part of maintaining a sufficient supply of high quality B1 floorspace in Newport and should be retained solely for employment use. It is recognised that the Business Park currently provides some ancillary facilities, such as a nursery, retail units, a public house and a hotel. These facilities, however, are intended to be ancillary to the employment uses at Celtic Springs and other nearby developments such as Cleppa Park. Our clients are not adverse to a limited expansion of complimentary ancillary services within the Business Park, but aside from this the allocation should be retained for employment.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

In conclusion, the land allocated for employment uses (primarily B1) under Policy EM1 (iii) should be retained to enable the future expansion of Celtic Springs and to maintain its position as a prestige business park. The allocation also forms an important part of addressing the shortage of modern, Grade A office accommodation in Newport. We therefore conclude that the proposed amendment to Policy EM1 (iii) should be dismissed as inappropriate and unnecessary by the Council and Inspector.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1600.K13 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 553/ Celtic Springs

Summary: Objection to proposed residential designation

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)029

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Celtic Springs

3 3 Representation
RAS(A)029

This area of land is surrounded by business uses. The policy of encouraging high tech business to this area should remain and the designation as employment land should remain.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3507.K12 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 553/ Celtic Springs

Summary: Supports proposed amendment to include residential development at Celtic Springs

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
We would support this.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3849.K14 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 553/ Celtic Springs

Summary: Objection to residential development at Celtic Springs

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(A)029

This area of land is surrounded by business uses. The policy of encouraging high tech business to this area should remain and the designation as employment land should remain.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3861.K4 | Cassidian Limited | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 553/ Celtic Springs

Summary: Objection to proposed residential development

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(A)029

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Celtic Springs

3 3 Representation

Cassidian Limited objects to the proposal to change the current LDP allocation of this site from an Employment Area, to Residential Led Mixed Use Development for the following reasons:

1. This would be sacrificing valuable space in what has been set out as an Employment Area on the Local Development Plan. The area undoubtedly is "prestigious land which has good access to transport links". Celtic Springs and its immediate surroundings are used almost exclusively for commercial and industrial purposes, providing the area to be one of the most compelling parts of Newport for companies to establish businesses.

2. In light of Newport's current unemployment situation (especially taking into account the high rate of unemployment in the area's 18-24 age group), the protection of the City's potentially high employment areas, is undoubtedly at the top of the Council's agenda. Accordingly, Cassidian objects to any decision the Council takes to change land use in any already proven industrial development area for what is, in essence, a residential proposal, outside a defined settlement boundary.

3. Any alternative use of Celtic Springs, would also restrict expansion opportunities for existing local businesses and those located further afield. When Cassidian moved to its premises at Celtic Springs, it was on the assumption that it would become part of a 'bigger business' community and 'mixed use' detracts from the further development of a business heartland.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3899.K1 | AWG Property Ltd | GVA Grimley | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 553/ Celtic Springs

Summary: Support proposed allocation of land for residential development in employment area

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)029

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Celtic Springs

3 3 Representation

The representation has been prepared by GVA on behalf of AWG Property Ltd (AWG) in response to the Alternative Site Consultation (Revised Deposit Stage) 2013.

The representations made at the Revised Deposit Plan stage emphasised the significant potential that the remaining undeveloped land at Celtic Springs presents as a residential led mixed use development opportunity. On behalf of AWG, we are pleased to note the inclusion of the site within the Alternative Sites Consultation.

This representation therefore re-emphasises our support for the proposed allocation, and our view that. Without this allocation the LDP would be unsound.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Wish to discuss the context and reasons for seeking the allocation of the remaining land at Celtic Springs as a mixed use development opportunity. It will be necessary to speak to provide an overview of the site's history and market context, together with explaining the rationale for its future development for mixed use.

Site,RepnType: 554/ Graig Y Saeson,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 42.K9 | Graig Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|-------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 554/ Graig Y Saeson

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment of SLA at Graig Y Saeson

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

And finally, my Council strongly objects to the removal of the following site, which is in the Marshfield Ward, but affects the Graig Ward

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 694.K8 | Caston, Mr R J | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 554/ Graig Y Saeson

Summary: Object to the removal of the site from the SLA (support the SLA allocation).

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)033

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Graig-y-Saeson

3 3 Representation

I support the City Council proposal to include the above sites in the Special Landscape Area. They include part of the avenue of trees that once extended thus far from Tredegar House. I therefore strongly object to the proposals to remove these sites from the Special Landscape Area.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

1600.K12 White, Cllr Richard

15/10/2013 E O M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 554/ Graig Y Saeson

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)033

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Graig Y Saeson

3 3 Representation
RAS(A)008

The designation on this land should remain to protect any features of importance if it is eventually developed as employment land.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K64 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 554/ Graig Y Saeson

Summary: Objection to proposed boundary amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Graig Y Saeson

Proposed amendment to boundary of area allocated in the Deposit LDP as SLA linked to proposed new housing alternative site. See comments on AS(N) 004 above.

Recommend existing boundary is maintained.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.

Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 3849.K13 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | M |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 554/ Graig Y Saeson

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment at Graig Y Saeson

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

RAS(A)008

The designation on this land should remain to protect any features of importance if it is eventually developed as employment land.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4128.K9 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 554/ Graig Y Saeson

Summary: Built conservation on Graig Y Saeson

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)019

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Graig Y Season

3 3 Representation
This site includes two scheduled ancient monuments (MM022 - Gwern Y Cleppa Burial Chamber abd MM134 - Coed Y Defaid Camp). The setting of these scheduled ancient monuments should be considered.

Site,RepnType: 555/ Commercial Road District Centre,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3507.K13 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 555/ Commercial Road District Centre

Summary: Supports proposed amendment of the Commercial Road District Centre boundary

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
We would support this.

Site,RepnType: 556/ Crindau,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 224.K2 | Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd | White Young Green | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 556/ Crindau

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)025

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Crindau

3 3 Representation

The Revised Deposit Plan Policy EM2 (vii) identifies sites at which regeneration schemes will be encouraged and distinguishes Crindau regeneration site as appropriate for Class B1, commercial, leisure and residential uses. The Revised Deposit Plan explicitly states at Paragraph 6.15 that 'reference to commercial uses does not include retail, unless it is of a small scale, related to the development in question or to cater for under provision in the area'. The Newport Unlimited 2020 Masterplan and the adopted Crindau Planning and Design Guidelines SPG (2008) make no reference to the need for retail development at the Crindau regeneration site. Notwithstanding the above, Part B of the Alternative Sites Register (September 2013) includes the allocation of the Crindau regeneration site to include the provision of retail use (Alternative Site Reference RAS(A)025). No indication is provided of the scale of retail allocation sought.

In light of the above points, SSL would like to lodge an objection against allocation of the site for any form of convenience retailing. There can be no justification for any form such retailing as the proposed residential development at the Crindau regeneration site will be fully served by the existing Sainsbury's supermarket and accordingly there is no "under provision in the area". Furthermore, SSL wish to lodge a holding objection to any allocation of comparison retail development until such time as the scale of development is clarified as being "small scale, related to the development [of the residual regeneration land] or to cater for under provision in the area', as required by Revised Deposit Plan paragraph 6.15.

SSL note that the marina concept scheme at Crindau has not progressed to date due to the current economic climate. Caution should be taken against permitting any large scale retail allocations which could jeopardize the function of the existing retail hierarchy or dilute the potential for residential led regeneration of the area.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3507.K11 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 556/ Crindau

Summary: Objection to proposed amendment to include Retail Uses at Crindau

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We do not support this proposed amendment as any further retails puts pressure on the City Centre which is the Councils priority.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K65 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 556/ Crindau

Summary: Further details required in the Plan

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Crindau Regeneration Site

Given the location adjacent to the River Usk SAC, any application at the site will be need to be the subject of a project level HRA to ensure that the development of the site will not adversely affect the SAC. We advise that this requirement is clearly stated in the Plan.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.

Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

Site,RepnType: 557/ Former Sainsburys,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K66 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 557/ Former Sainsburys

Summary: Proposed change at this site will need to be considered as part of the HRA

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Former Sainsburys

Given the location adjacent to the River Usk SAC, any application at the proposed alternative site will be need to be the subject of a project level HRA to ensure that the development of the site will not adversely affect the SAC.

As part of the LDP process, the proposed change to at this site will need to be considered as part of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.

Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

Site,RepnType: 558/ River Usk,

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| 3683.K67 | Natural Resources Wales | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | M |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 558/ River Usk

Summary: Support the amendments

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation River Usk We welcome the amended Developed Coastal Zone Boundary. |
|---|---|--|

Site,RepnType: 559/ Newport Wetlands,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K68 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 559/ Newport Wetlands

Summary: Support the proposed changes

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Newport Wetlands NNR
We welcome the factual clarification provided in the proposed change.

Site,RepnType: 560/ Newport Wetlands and Nash Goldcliff SSSIs,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3683.K69 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 560/ Newport Wetlands and Nash Goldcliff SSSIs

Summary: Support the proposed changes

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Newport Wetlands SSSI and Gwent Levels – Nash and Goldcliff SSSI
We welcome the factual clarification provided in the proposed change.

Site,RepnType: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 28.K2 | Newbridge Construction Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for the expansion of Regeneration Allocation EM2(ii)

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent to former tipping area |
| 3 | 3 | Representation If it is the intention that additional dwellings would also be provided within the proposed extension of Regeneration Allocation – EM2(ii) then we object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)027 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)027 seeks an increase to the Regeneration Allocation EM2(ii) Llanwern Former Tipping Area South of Queensway. It is unclear as to whether any additional residential development is proposed, however if it is then the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather consideration should be given at locations where people want to live. In this regard it is considered that the capacity of site H1 (12) – Former Tredegar Park Golf Course should be increased to 200 dwellings to allow a more efficient use of the land and to contribute deliverable housing towards the required need. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 208.K2 | RSPB | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area

Summary: Objection to proposed settlement boundary amendment at Land adjacent Former Tipping Area

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

Introduction:

The RSPB objects to the alternative site proponent's representations, as follows. We consider that they go to the heart of the plan, and render it unsound:

The alternative sites proponent makes two proposed amendments to the Revised Deposit Draft LDP. However, as they are two aspects of the same issue (and at some locations referred to the same land) they will be addressed together in this representation. Where the alternative site proponent's representations cover different aspects, this will be indicated in the main body of this representation.

Need:

The alternative site proponent makes a number of references (for example at paragraph 1.6 (a) and 3.6 of his representation to issues of need. For example at paragraph 1.6 (a) he states that the reduction in size of this allocation:-

"does not recognise the full development potential and extent of the Tata land holdings, and the contribution this land could make to the aims and objectives to the LDP".

However, given the fact that the RLDP proposes to allocate more than 7 times that required using a trend-based approach, former EM1 (ii) could be deleted in its entirety from the LDP without having any impact whatsoever on its ability to attain its employment provision target. The allocation of EM1 (ii) would thus have been a very substantial over-allocation of some 103.83 hectares which would, at present take up rates of 11.4 hectares per year (described at paragraph 2.70 of the LDP as "appropriate") would have taken the entire local planning authority's employment takeup for over 9 years. Even this is an underestimate, given that an element of the additional approximately 469 hectares allocated in policy EM2 (Regeneration Sites) would also be employment land development. Thus this is a very significant over-allocation, even taking into account for the need for flexibility in the chosen range of sites for development, and the development of all employment land allocated in the LDP could only take place beyond the plan period. Welsh Government policy is that land should not be allocated for development beyond the plan period.

Similarly, the statement at paragraph 3.6 that: -

"the diminished size of this employment allocation in the RD LDP could potentially stifle the opportunity for Newport to achieve large-scale employment generating development"

is also incorrect, as the provision of such sites is already very well catered for, in far less damaging locations, without the need for this extension

It is instructive to note that in his Report into the 2005 UDP Public Inquiry, the Inspector stated :-

"Bearing in mind the requirement set out Section 28G in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 for the Council to take reasonable steps, consistent with the proper exercise of its functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the flora and fauna of this Site of Special Scientific Interest I would expect such a site to be allocated for development only if there was a need to do so. The Council has not demonstrated such a need" (emphasis added).

There has been no material changes in circumstances since the 2005 Inquiry – indeed the economic downturn renders his report more relevant than ever, give the low trend-based figures for the uptake of employment land.

Flexibility:

Paragraph 1.6 (b) of the alternative site proponent's representations state: -

"this allocation... does not include sufficient flexibility to allow a range of mixed use opportunities to be delivered over the LDP period".

However this is not the case, even allowing for the need to provide a range and choice of sites for the reasons set out above.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

The Newport Unitary Development Plan:

The alternative site proponent cites at paragraph 2.4 the fact that land to the east and west of proposed allocation EM2 (ii) was allocated in the Newport UDP, as evidence in support of its allocation in the LDP. However, the LDP will supersede the UDP, which will have no materiality thereafter; therefore the fact of its allocation in an old development plan carries no weight. The simple rolling forward of old allocations from old development plans into new ones is not permissible under Welsh planning law.

An M4 Relief Road:

The alternative site proponent refers to an M4 Relief Road at a number of locations in his representation, for example at paragraphs 2.6, 2.11 and 3.7.

At paragraph 2.6 he states:-

"the treatment of our client's land in this manner (i.e. as being outside the settlement boundary) appears to ignore the potential future changes that the route of the safeguarded M4 Relief Road could bring to this part of Newport".

The RSPB would like to make the following point in relation to this matter:-

Whilst the line of an M4 Relief Road has been safeguarded for many years, there is no certainty that the present or a future Welsh Government will pursue it. The local planning authority is reminded that possibility of an M4 Relief Road has been mooted by successive governments for approximately 28 years. A draft plan produced by the Welsh Government is currently under consultation, but the protected line is only one of three alternatives examined. Furthermore, no funding source for its construction has been secured, and no consent application applied for.

Until such time as the above matters have been resolved, it is not appropriate to cite a possible future development proposal in support of an alteration to change the settlement boundary.

It is further important to note that one of the transport-related problems identified by the Welsh Government in support of its view that congestion around the city of Newport is a serious matter is that it considers that the existing M4 has too many junctions connecting it with Newport. Indeed, one possible measure discussed in Welsh Government documentation in relation to this matter cites the closure of some existing junctions as a possible measure to reduce congestion. It is instructive to note that in the Welsh Government's current consultation, there is a proposal to remove the motorway status of the existing M4, thus allowing the retention of its junctions.

It is inconceivable therefore that having identified the oversupply of junctions as a major contributory factor in the triggering of congestion, and suggested measures to address this, the Welsh Government would contemplate adding junctions to an M4 Relief Road.

Thus reference in the alternative site proponent's representation at paragraph 2.11 to including land between the protected line and his land holdings is unnecessary, as no motorway access at these locations would be permitted were an M4 Relief Road to be progressed. We remind the local planning authority that this land is partially within the Gwent Levels SSSI and would therefore be subject to the adverse impacts discussed elsewhere in this representation, and in previous representations by the RSPB.

Adverse Impacts on the SSSI:

The alternative site proponent addresses the issue of damage to the SSSI (at paragraph 3.5 et seq) in two ways.

1.The Role of Mitigation in Removing Adverse Impacts on the SSSI:

The alternative site proponent states: -

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

"it is considered that the inclusion of the Tata land within allocation EM1 (ii) can take full account of such constraints and issues".

However, he provides no evidence whatsoever to support this assertion. It is the view of the RSPB, garnered over many years' involvement with development on the Gwent Levels SSSI's, that significant built development and SSSI interests cannot coexist on the same site. This is borne out by evidence supplied by the Gwent Wildlife Trust to the Public Inquiry into the Newport Unitary Development Plan, as follows :-

Past Use of Planning Conditions in Respect of Planning Applications on the Gwent Levels:

The RSPB's view that the use of planning conditions and obligations cannot remove adverse impacts on the SSSI interest is supported by a 2005 desk study , which examined the efficacy of conditions imposed in respect of some major planning applications on the Gwent Levels in Newport, looking at the results of post-construction monitoring.

Construction of Distribution Depot, Associated Trailer Parks and Car Parking, etc. Approved 6th August 1993

CCW did not recommend to the then Welsh Office that the call in the application be called-in, due to a commitment on the part of the developer to the highest environmental standards being conditioned on the application by the Newport County borough Council.

Post-construction monitoring in respect of this application showed that, in spite of he imposition of conditions :-

- All surveys conducted indicate a substantial impact on the reens as a result of the development.
- The ecosystems affected displayed different rates of recovery, or no recovery at all.
- The aquatic invertebrate communities identified in the baseline survey have shown a continued decline throughout the survey period.
- These loses in abundance and diversity were a result of the construction works.

Erection of 76,000 sq m Distribution Centre with Parking, Loading, Offices, etc. Approved 26th August 1999:

Post-construction monitoring showed that, in spite of the imposition of conditions:

- The site failed to recover from a large discharge of sulphate during the early stages of the development and from other sources.
- High sulphate levels resulted in white and red algal blooms, and sulphur bacteria blooms in the reens on site, which in turn led to a reduction in the abundance and diversity of important invertebrate and plant species.
- High levels of other pollutants and poor water quality were recorded throughout the monitoring period.
- Sulphate levels in the balancing pond have stabilised at around 241 mg/l, far in excess of the 200 mg/l level deemed serious by CCW.
- pH levels remained consistently high and in excess of acceptable levels
- Since development ceased floral diversity improved marginally in some reens, while in others it decreased further.
- Very few rare or notable plant species have been recorded since development began.
- Only 2 notable aquatic/semi aquatic invertebrate species were found on site at the end of the monitoring period. And amongst the semi aquatic invertebrates there has been a substantial decrease in diversity.

We consider that there have been no material changes in circumstances since the 2005 Public Inquiry, therefore this evidence stands.

2.Reference to Text in the First Deposit Version of the LDP (April 2012):

At paragraph 3.5 the alternative site proponent states:-

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

"the wording of policy EM1 (ii) in the Deposit Version of the plan made it clear that proposals for this area would have to demonstrate that the national economic benefits of the proposals outweigh the environmental impacts, including... damage to habitats and species... within the SSSI".

However, this is erroneous, because the above text is present in the Deposit Draft Version of the LDP (April 2012), which has been superseded by the Revised Deposit Draft LDP (June 2013), from which the text cited by the alternative site proponent is wholly absent.

The alternative site proponent has not lodged a representation seeking the reinstatement of this wording in the Revised Draft LDP, therefore one must assume that he is content with it.

3.Sustainability Appraisal (Strategic Environmental Assessment):

It is instructive to note that the alternative site proponent has not carried out a Sustainability Appraisal (Strategic Environmental Assessment) pursuant to his representation in respect of Land East of Queens Way Meadows.

"If an alternative site has already been assessed as part of the authority's earlier SA of options, but a developer or owner objects to the outcome of the LPA's assessment and seeks to have that site included, it will be dealt with at the examination as an objection. It will be helpful for the proponent to demonstrate why they consider the LPA's assessment is flawed"

However, this does not appear to have been the case, and there is no evidence that the alternative site proponent has objected to the Sustainability Appraisal in respect of this site.

Paragraph 7.5.2 of the LDP Manual further states:-

"if an... alternative site has not been subject to SA, it is unlikely that the Inspector will be in a position to recommend its inclusion in the LDP".

The local planning authority is reminded that the SEA of the site at the LDP stage recommended its removal from the LDP.

4.Site Reference RAS(A) 027 only:

The alternative site proponent seeks to include land abutting the southern boundary of the Tata holding and north of the safeguarded line of an M4 Relief Road within the settlement/urban boundary on two grounds, one of which the RSPB addresses below:-

- That this in some unspecified way provides for further development in this area (apart from that portion of it which the alternative site proponent makes representation in support of its' becoming an allocation).

However, the RSPB considers that this should carry no weight because:-

The alternative site proponent does not advocate that this land becomes allocated (apart from the exception referred to above) as employment land in the LDP – merely that it is located within the settlement/urban boundary. This would render it vulnerable to environmentally damaging development outside the provisions of the LDP, because it would be "white land". This is very bad planning practice, which undermines the primacy of the development plan. Furthermore, it is predicated on the theory that proximity to a possible future M4 Relief Road would convey considerable development potential to this land. As discussed above this is very unlikely to manifest itself.

Tests of Soundness:

The RSPB considers that were the local planning authority to comply with the alternative site proponents representation, the plan would fail the following tests of soundness :-

C2: It would not have regard for national planning policy, because it would further damage to a SSSI, without proving that the need to do so clearly outweighs the harm this would result in, and because

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

of the creation of white land, and allocating land for development which is effectively beyond the plan period

CE1: It is not in conformity with the policies of the RLDP with regard to nature conservation and a realistic and achievable employment land delivery strategy

CE1: It would not be coherent, because there is no need for it

P2: The alternative site proponent has not carried out a SA/SEA in respect of it, nor objected to the SEA Environmental Report's conclusion in relation to this site and vicinity.

In the interests of consistency, the RSPB restates below its objection to the development of SSSI and UKBAP priority land covered by the alternative site proponent's representation, as follows :-

1. The alternative site is partly within the Gwent Levels SSSI, which is a statutorily designated site of national importance for nature conservation, and part of a network of national sites.
 2. NRW has identified the habitat type of the proposed allocation as Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh. This is a UK and Welsh Biodiversity Priority Habitat type for which an action plan has been written. It has also been identified by the Welsh Government as a habitat of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biological diversity, pursuant of s42 of the NERC Act.
 3. The proposed allocation would have significant and irreversible adverse impacts on the designated interest of the SSSI. These impacts will be both direct and indirect.
 4. The proposed allocation would have significant and irreversible adverse impacts on the coastal grazing marsh habitat of acknowledged importance. These impacts will be direct and indirect, and will include the physical destruction of the habitat.
5. Welsh Government policy to prioritise brownfield development over greenfield development means that it would be developed after Newport's very large brownfield land resource. Notwithstanding the question of referred to above, this would be several decades after the end of the plan period, which frustrates WG policy on the certainty and deliverability of LDPs.
- 6.
6. To allocate this site would be contrary to the following :-
- a. Section 28G of the NERC Act, which sets out the duties of the local planning authority, the Inspector, and the Welsh Government, with regard to the protection and enhancement of SSSIs
 - b. Section 42 of the NERC Act, which sets out the Welsh Government, and the local planning authority, duties in respect of the UK BAP process with regards to the coastal grazing marsh habitat of acknowledged importance for biological diversity.
 - c. Planning Policy Wales 2012, "LDP's Wales 2005", and TAN 5 (Nature Conservation) 2009, which sets out local planning authority and Welsh Government duties in respect of sustainable development, environmental protection and enhancement, statutorily designated sites of national nature conservation interest, the UK BAP and LBAP process, pollution, certainty and planning conditions and obligations.
 - d. The Revised Deposit Draft Local Development Plan, in particular its approach to sustainable development, environmental protection and enhancement, statutorily designated sites of national nature conservation importance, the UK BAP and the LBAP process, replacement habitats, use of planning conditions and obligations, pollution and SEA/SA.
 - e. The sustainability appraisal of the development plan and the strategic environmental assessment of the development plan.

Background :

The Gwent Levels:

The alternative site objected to by the RSPB falls partly within the Gwent Levels Sites of Special Scientific Interest, notified under S28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

The Gwent Levels SSSIs cover between them 5,700 ha of the Severn Estuary's northern shoreline. These contiguous SSSIs represent the largest reclaimed lowland of National importance in Wales and are ranked amongst the 5 most important habitats of this type in the United Kingdom (The Gwent Levels, Their Importance for Nature Conservation, and Commitments for their Protection Martin Wragg, 1995). The statutorily designated conservation interest is to be found associated with the extensive network of reens and drainage ditches passing through the area. This drainage network supports 25 species of locally or Nationally scarce plants and 144 locally or Nationally scarce species of invertebrates. The wide variety of habitats within the Gwent Levels provides important feeding, roosting and breeding grounds for 8 species of wintering wader, as well as supporting populations of 13 species of mammals and herptofauna protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Reens and drainage ditches crossing these lowlands form fenceless field boundaries and many of these fields are categorised as coastal grazing marsh.

Likely Significant Adverse Impacts of the Proposed Allocation on the Biodiversity Value of the Site:

The likely significant adverse impacts arising as a result of the development of the site are both direct and indirect

Direct:

•Physical destruction of the Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh (UK, Welsh and Newport Priority Habitat) through built development. It would not be possible to mitigate for this adverse impact

•Physical destruction of the reens SSSI notified interest through built development. It would not be possible to mitigate for this adverse impact.

Indirect:

Eutrophication: Landscaping would be required as part of the development. This would involve tree-planting. Leaf fall would cause eutrophication of the reens, (SSSI feature) which would significantly adversely impact on water quality. The flora and fauna of the reens rely on very high water quality, and are very sensitive to falls in quality. Please see assessments of a sample of post-construction monitoring studies carried out pursuant to planning conditions in respect of consented application for more information in respect of this matter. It would not be possible to enforce a planning condition in relation to this matter.

Chemical Pollution of Reen Interest: Hydrocarbon runoff from hard surfacing, and diffuse pollution from herbicides, pesticides and insecticides associated with maintenance of developments. It would not be possible to frame a planning condition or obligation, or enforce them, in relation to this matter, because inter alia it would not be possible to isolate individual sources of such pollution, or to stop them from entering the hydrological system, upon which the SSSI and Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh interest depends.

Blocking of Management of Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh (UK, Wales and Newport Priority Habitat) and Reens (SSSI): In the interests of health and safety, development would be likely to block access on the part of the machinery which is required to operate in or in close proximity to Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh and reens.

Water Level Fluctuations: Fluctuations in water level during and following development can have profound effects on invertebrate populations. This is especially so when ditches are temporarily drained to allow construction, and as a result of rapid runoff from impervious surfaces such as car and lorry parks. As the site is located within the floodplain, and requires a Strategic Flood Consequences Assessment, drainage would be required to develop the site.

National and Local Policy Context:

Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

The Council has a duty in respect of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) under (hereafter referred to as the CROW Act). This duty affects the weight the Council should give to the conservation and enhancement of SSSIs in exercising its statutory planning functions, including the preparation of development plans and relevant proposals for land-use allocations.

The following are section 28G authorities-

- (a) A Minister of the Crown (within the meaning of the Ministers of the Crown Act 1975) or a Government department;
- (b) The Welsh Government (hereafter referred to as the WG) and an Inspector appointed by the WG
- (c) A local authority;

Paragraph 45 of the Assembly's Circular 31/2001 (Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000) makes it clear that the section 28G duty applies whenever a local authority is exercising its functions.

"45.New section 28G, inserted in the 1981 Act, imposes an important new duty on public bodies, exercising statutory functions that may affect SSSIs, to take reasonable steps, consistent with the proper exercise of these functions, to further the conservation and enhancement of the features for which the site is of special interest. Public bodies specifically include local authorities and the duty applies wherever they are exercising their functions. The Welsh Government expects public bodies to apply strict tests when carrying out functions within or affecting SSSIs, to ensure that they minimise adverse effects, and to adopt the highest standards of management in relation to SSSIs that they own." (emphasis added)

Para 5.4.3 of PPW states :-

"This duty applies to the Welsh Ministers, Ministers of the Crown, local planning authorities, statutory undertakers and any other public body"

From this guidance, it is clear that in preparing its new LDP the local planning authority should have:

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

- “Taken all reasonable steps to ensure it conserved and enhanced all of the SSSIs within its area;
- In identifying potential land-use allocations, favouring those that would avoid adverse effects on SSSIs;
- Applied strict tests to any land-use allocations that could damage an SSSI to ensure that adverse effects could be mitigated in full in order to avoid such damage;
- If land-use allocations were to be pursued that were likely to cause damage to SSSIs (even with mitigation) that such damage could be fully justified i.e. it should clearly override the national importance of the SSSI and the Council had no less damaging alternative sites available to meet the identified need, and
- That appropriate habitat compensation could be provided for any likely damage to a SSSI likely to arise from such an allocation and that proper provision was made in the plan policy for such compensation to ensure that the interest of the SSSI network was conserved”

(emphasis added)

Were the local planning authority to allocate this site, it would not have taken all reasonable steps to ensure it conserved and enhanced all of the SSSIs within its area. It would have failed to apply strict tests to any landuse allocations that could damage a SSSI , and would have failed to show that adverse effects cannot be adequately mitigated or compensated for. It would have thus failed to set out how, in its view, the proposed allocation clearly override the national importance of the SSSI, failed to identify need, and failed to show conclusively that it had no less damaging alternative sites.

The UK, Welsh and Newport Biodiversity Processes , and s42 and s41(3) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

Over and above its designation of an SSSI, the site of the proposed allocation consists of Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh, which is a Priority Habitat under the UK and Welsh Biodiversity processes for which a Habitat Action Plan (hereafter referred to as HAP) has been produced at the UK and Newport levels, and is in preparation at the Welsh level. Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh is also placed on a list pursuant of section 42 of the NERC Act , as being considered by the Welsh Government as being of principal importance for the purpose of the conservation of biological diversity.

Paragraph 5.2.2 of PPW states that the NERC Act places a duty on local planning authorities (and the WG) to take (and to encourage others to take) reasonably practicable steps to further the conservation (including restoration and enhancement) of Priority Habitat types. The selection criteria for Priority Habitat types are that they must be habitats for which the UK has international obligations, habitats at risk, such as those with a high rate of decline, especially over the last 20 years or which are rare, habitats which may be functionally critical and habitats which are important for Priority Species

The RSPB is of the view that to reject this alternative site would be to take a reasonably practicable step to further the conservation of this habitat type, which is of acknowledged importance. This duty applies to the WG itself.

The Newport Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh HAP cites eutrophication as a primary, widespread threat, and industrialisation and urbanisation as localised threats. The RSPB concurs with this, considers that allocation of the alternative site would result in eutrophication. The RSPB concurs with the HAP that industrialisation and urbanisation, as exemplified by this proposed allocation is a threat to Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh.

Planning Policy Wales 2012

Sustainable Development and Planning Policy Wales 2012:

Paragraph 1.4.3 of Planning Policy Wales 2012 (hereafter referred to a PPW) states that the Welsh Government has a specific duty regarding sustainable development, namely that “it the (WG) promotes sustainable development”, via the s79 of the Government of Wales Act 2006.

Paragraph 1.4.3 further states that this duty has implications for the planning system.

It is the thus the view of the RSPB that the WG duty in relation to sustainable development set out in the Government of Wales Act must be addressed through inter alia the town and country planning system in Wales, and that to allocate this alternative site, which would have a material adverse impact on statutorily designated sites of national nature conservation importance a UK Biodiversity Priority Habitat would be counter to sustainable development, and thus to the Government of Wales Act 1998.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Paragraph 4.1.4. of PPW, in setting out how the Welsh Government promotes sustainable development, states that it is:-

“placing sustainability at the heart of its decision making processes” (Bullet Point1).

In respect of the Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh Priority Habitat, para 5.4.2 of PPW states that the town and country planning system in Wales must :-

“forge and strengthen links between the town and country planning system and biodiversity action planning particularly through policies in local development plans”

It is the view of the RSPB that this emphasis on promoting sustainable development through decision-making means that the alternative site allocation should not be allocated in the LDP.

The Environmental Element of Sustainable Development

Paragraph 4.4.1 states that WG's key policy objectives should be taken into account in the preparation of LDPs.

The WG's principles in relation to sustainable development, as set out in paragraph 4.1.2 of PPW, elucidates the environmental element of sustainable development, through stating in Bullet Point 4 that environmental limits will be respected. The RSPB considers that were this allocation to be permitted, environmental limits would not be respected.

Paragraph 4.4.2 (Bullet Point 7) cites planning as a key policy tool contributing to the protection and improvement of the environment so as to protect local and global ecosystems. In particular planning should “seek to ensure that development does not produce irreversible harmful effects on the natural environment”. Bullet Point 7 further cites as an objective the conservation and enhancement of statutorily designated sites and the conservation of biodiversity.

Chapter 5 of PPW contains the WG's planning policy relating to conserving and improving natural heritage.

Statutorily Designated Sites:

Paragraph 5.1.2 (Bullet Point 3) states the WG's objectives in relation to this matter include ensuring that statutorily designated sites are properly protected. It is the RSPB's view that the Gwent Levels, as a statutorily designated site should be protected from damaging development.

Paragraph 5.3.2 states that regard should be had to the relative significance of international, national, and local designations when considering the weight to be attached to nature conservation interests. As the Gwent Levels SSSI is designated at the national level and therefore towards the top of the hierarchy, the RSPB is of the view that significant weight should be attached to this proposed allocation, which would have a material adverse impact upon them.

Paragraph 5.3.1 states that statutorily designated sites make a vital contribution to protecting biodiversity. The RSPB concurs with this.

Paragraph 5.3.9 of PPW states that the WG will ensure that statutorily designated sites (of which the Gwent Levels SSSI is one) are protected against damage and deterioration (consistent with the objectives of the designation). The RSPB considers that to permit this proposed allocation would be to fail to comply with this requirement.

Para 5.2 of PPW further states that:-

“local planning authorities should further the conservation of habitats of principal importance through their planning function”

This strengthens the materiality of the need to protect this habitat via the LDP.

A further principle, as set out in Bullet Point 8 of para 4.3.1. states that pollution should be prevented as far as possible and that the polluter pays for damage resulting from pollution. The RSPB considers that eutrophication of the SSSI ree interest which is likely to occur as a result of the development of their proposed allocation is a form of pollution.

Supplementary Planning Guidance “Wildlife and Development” 2010:

Section 3, Bullet Point 4 (page 6) of the Supplementary Planning Guidance “Wildlife and Development” 2010 states :-

“The Council has an obligation to protect (legally protected sites) as part of the planning process”

The RSPB considers that to delete this site would be in conformity with his obligation.

Table 1 (page 8) of the SPG states that, in relating to nationally important designated sites, there is a :-

“Strong presumption against damaging development”

As the RSPB considers that the development of this site would be damaging, the Council would, if it wishes to allocate the site, have to surmount this strong presumption. The RSPB considers that it has failed to do so.

The Brownfield Test:

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Para 4.8.1 of PPW states :-

"Previously developed (or brownfield) land should, wherever possible, be used in preference to greenfield sites, particularly those of high ecological value"

The SSSI designation, and UK, Wales and Newport Biodiversity Priority Habitat classification of the Gwent Levels shows that they are of high ecological value, and the fact that there is no need for the proposed allocation shows that it is possible to use brownfield land in preference.

Policy SP1 of the Revised Deposit Draft LDP (criterion (ii)) states :-

PROPOSALS WILL BE REQUIRED TO MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT BY CONCENTRATING DEVELOPMENT IN SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS ON BROWNFIELD LAND WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY. THEY WILL BE ASSESSED AS TO THEIR POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO:

- i) THE EFFICIENT USE OF LAND;
- ii) THE REUSE OF PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND AND EMPTY PROPERTIES IN PREFERENCE TO GREENFIELD SITES;

The RSPB supports this policy, and furthermore believes that with the largest brownfield resource in Wales, it is possible to act in conformity with it.

Paragraph 1.21 of "LDP's Wales 2006" states: -

"it is important that proposals are... likely to be implemented during the plan period".

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the RSPB is firmly of the view that to allocate this alternative site , which would have significant adverse effects on a statutorily designated site of national nature conservation interest and on a threatened habitat of acknowledged importance, would be contrary to national and local planning policy and good practice, and to UK and Welsh legislation relating to the Welsh Government's duties in relation to sustainable development, the protection of the environment, protection and enhancement of SSSI's and the protection of UK, Welsh and Newport BAP and s42 priority habitats.

It would further be in conflict with established and widely recognised good planning practice in terms of environmental assessment, the resourceful use of land, and the use of supplementary planning guidance.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

I would like to speak about the adverse impacts on the SSSI and on the wider planning policy aspects of the alternative site proponent's case

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 321.K2 | Newbridge Ests & John Fmly | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land to extend regeneration allocation EM2(ii)

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent to former tipping area |
| 3 | 3 | Representation If it is the intention that additional dwellings would also be provided within the proposed extension of Regeneration Allocation – EM2(ii) then we object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)027 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)027 seeks an increase to the Regeneration Allocation EM2(ii) Llanwern Former Tipping Area South of Queensway. It is unclear as to whether any additional residential development is proposed, however if it is then the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (RAS(N)030) is a highly suitable alternative it: <input type="checkbox"/> Immediately adjoins the settlement of Rhiwderin; <input type="checkbox"/> Is in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport and is a sustainable location; <input type="checkbox"/> readily links into the existing highways network; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1117.K2 | Herbert, Richard | Boyer Planning | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area

Summary: Objection to proposed extension of regeneration allocation EM2(ii)

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent to former tipping area |
| 3 | 3 | Representation <p>If it is the intention that additional dwellings would also be provided within the proposed extension of Regeneration Allocation – EM2(ii) then we object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)027 being unsound in terms of the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. <p>The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)027 seeks an increase to the Regeneration Allocation EM2(ii) Llanwern Former Tipping Area South of Queensway.</p> <p>It is unclear as to whether any additional residential development is proposed, however if it is then the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.</p> <p>The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Llwynhaid, Bettws (RASN031) is a highly suitable alternative it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sits immediately adjoining the settlement boundary; <input type="checkbox"/> The site is visually and physically well contained; <input type="checkbox"/> is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services; <input type="checkbox"/> is well served by public transport; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1418.K2 | Pontymister Dev Ltd | Boyer Planning | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land for expansion of Regeneration Allocation EM2(ii)

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent former tipping area |
| 3 | 3 | Representation <p>If it is the intention that additional dwellings would also be provided within the proposed extension of Regeneration Allocation – EM2(ii) then we object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)027 being unsound in terms of the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. <p>The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)027 seeks an increase to the Regeneration Allocation EM2(ii) Llanwern Former Tipping Area South of Queensway.</p> <p>It is unclear as to whether any additional residential development is proposed, however if it is then the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.</p> <p>The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Risca Road, Rogerstone (RAS(N025) is a highly suitable alternative it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sits immediately adjoining the settlement boundary and would be integrated with the existing pattern of built development; <input type="checkbox"/> is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services; <input type="checkbox"/> is well served by public transport; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1666.K2 | Murray, Mrs H E | Boyer Planning | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area

Summary: Objection to proposed expansion of regeneration allocation at land adjacent to former tipping area (south of Queensway).

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land adjacent to former tipping area

3 3 Representation

If it is the intention that additional dwellings would also be provided within the proposed extension of Regeneration Allocation – EM2(ii) then we object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)027 being unsound in terms of the following tests:

- CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and
- CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs.

The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)027 seeks an increase to the Regeneration Allocation EM2(ii) Llanwern Former Tipping Area South of Queensway.

It is unclear as to whether any additional residential development is proposed, however if it is then the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport.

The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at The Griffin, Bassaleg (RAS(N)024) is a highly suitable alternative it:

- would be integrated with the existing pattern of built development;
- provide a mixed use scheme comprising of residential and leisure/educational development;
- is a sustainable location, accessible to a number of facilities and services;
- has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live.

4 4 Additional Material

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 2072.K2 | Newbridge Estates Ltd | Boyer Planning | - Cardiff | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area

Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of land to expand Regeneration Allocation EM2(ii)

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Land adjacent to former tipping area |
| 3 | 3 | Representation If it is the intention that additional dwellings would also be provided within the proposed extension of Regeneration Allocation – EM2(ii) then we object to the proposed Alternative Site RAS(A)027 being unsound in terms of the following tests: - CE2 in that this approach is not realistic or appropriate and is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and - CE4 in that the proposed housing allocation does not provide a reasonable level of flexibility to allow a range and choice of housing to meet local needs. The submitted Alternative Site RAS(A)027 seeks an increase to the Regeneration Allocation EM2(ii) Llanwern Former Tipping Area South of Queensway. It is unclear as to whether any additional residential development is proposed, however if it is then the additional development proposed at this location would result in a further protrusion into the countryside. Moreover, given the proposed amount of residential development within the Eastern Expansion Area, Glan Llyn (former Llanwern Steelworks), Woodland Site Ringland and Hartridge High School, amounting to approximately 5,500 dwellings, the allocation of further residential development at the site would not contribute to balanced future growth as it would be significantly skewed towards the east of Newport. The provision of further extension to allocations within the location will result in a lack of flexibility in choice and range of housing, and rather the most appropriate means of providing for development at Newport is through appropriate land releases that respond to existing patterns of development, movement, community facilities and areas in which people want to live. In this regard, land at Gloch Wen, Rhiwderin (RAS(N)030) is a highly suitable alternative it: <input type="checkbox"/> Immediately adjoins the settlement of Rhiwderin; <input type="checkbox"/> Is in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport and is a sustainable location; <input type="checkbox"/> readily links into the existing highways network; <input type="checkbox"/> has been demonstrated in the submitted evidence to the Newport Local Development Plan as deliverable and assisting in providing certainty over delivery and housing supply and providing a range and choice of housing within an area people want to live. |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K70 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area

Summary: Objection to the proposed amendments

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

Land adjacent Former Tipping Area

There appears to be no evidence to support the proposed amendment to the Special Landscape Areas (SLA) boundary other than a desire to extend the area allocated for regeneration. As the LDP SLA boundaries are evidence based, we consider that the existing Revised Deposit LDP boundaries should be retained, and the proposed amendment not accepted.

Further, the proposed amended boundary includes an area notified as the Gwent Levels – Nash and Goldcliff SSSI. Any development within this amended boundary is likely to lead to the direct loss or damage of the SSSI. This proposed change is therefore inconsistent with the Revised LDP's objective to protect and enhance the natural environment and your authority's duty under Section 28g of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (as amended).

We recommend that the proposed amendment is not accepted, and would remind you of your authority's duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reasons of which the site is of special interest.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.

Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 4128.K12 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | M |
|-----------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 561/ Land adj Former Tipping Area

Summary: Historic environment comments on Land at Former Tipping Area

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number |
| | | RAS(A)027 |

| | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name |
| | | Land adj Former Tipping Area |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
| | | These sites include a grade II listed building (17543 - Tatton Farm). Development to the Western end of these sites is likely to adversely affect the rural setting of the farmhouse. |

Site,RepnType: 562/ East of Queensway Meadows,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 208.K1 | RSPB | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 562/ East of Queensway Meadows

Summary: Objection to proposed settlement boundary amendment at East of Queensway Meadows

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

Introduction:

The RSPB objects to the alternative site proponent's representations, as follows. We consider that they go to the heart of the plan, and render it unsound:

The alternative sites proponent makes two proposed amendments to the Revised Deposit Draft LDP. However, as they are two aspects of the same issue (and at some locations referred to the same land) they will be addressed together in this representation. Where the alternative site proponent's representations cover different aspects, this will be indicated in the main body of this representation.

Need:

The alternative site proponent makes a number of references (for example at paragraph 1.6 (a) and 3.6 of his representation to issues of need. For example at paragraph 1.6 (a) he states that the reduction in size of this allocation:-

"does not recognise the full development potential and extent of the Tata land holdings, and the contribution this land could make to the aims and objectives to the LDP".

However, given the fact that the RLDP proposes to allocate more than 7 times that required using a trend-based approach, former EM1 (ii) could be deleted in its entirety from the LDP without having any impact whatsoever on its ability to attain its employment provision target. The allocation of EM1 (ii) would thus have been a very substantial over-allocation of some 103.83 hectares which would, at present take up rates of 11.4 hectares per year (described at paragraph 2.70 of the LDP as "appropriate") would have taken the entire local planning authority's employment takeup for over 9 years. Even this is an underestimate, given that an element of the additional approximately 469 hectares allocated in policy EM2 (Regeneration Sites) would also be employment land development. Thus this is a very significant over-allocation, even taking into account for the need for flexibility in the chosen range of sites for development, and the development of all employment land allocated in the LDP could only take place beyond the plan period. Welsh Government policy is that land should not be allocated for development beyond the plan period.

Similarly, the statement at paragraph 3.6 that: -

"the diminished size of this employment allocation in the RD LDP could potentially stifle the opportunity for Newport to achieve large-scale employment generating development"

is also incorrect, as the provision of such sites is already very well catered for, in far less damaging locations, without the need for this extension

It is instructive to note that in his Report into the 2005 UDP Public Inquiry, the Inspector stated :-

"Bearing in mind the requirement set out Section 28G in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 for the Council to take reasonable steps, consistent with the proper exercise of its functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the flora and fauna of this Site of Special Scientific Interest I would expect such a site to be allocated for development only if there was a need to do so. The Council has not demonstrated such a need" (emphasis added).

There has been no material changes in circumstances since the 2005 Inquiry – indeed the economic downturn renders his report more relevant than ever, give the low trend-based figures for the uptake of employment land.

Flexibility:

Paragraph 1.6 (b) of the alternative site proponent's representations state: -

"this allocation... does not include sufficient flexibility to allow a range of mixed use opportunities to be delivered over the LDP period".

However this is not the case, even allowing for the need to provide a range and choice of sites for the reasons set out above.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

The Newport Unitary Development Plan:

The alternative site proponent cites at paragraph 2.4 the fact that land to the east and west of proposed allocation EM2 (ii) was allocated in the Newport UDP, as evidence in support of its allocation in the LDP. However, the LDP will supersede the UDP, which will have no materiality thereafter; therefore the fact of its allocation in an old development plan carries no weight. The simple rolling forward of old allocations from old development plans into new ones is not permissible under Welsh planning law.

An M4 Relief Road:

The alternative site proponent refers to an M4 Relief Road at a number of locations in his representation, for example at paragraphs 2.6, 2.11 and 3.7.

At paragraph 2.6 he states:-

"the treatment of our client's land in this manner (i.e. as being outside the settlement boundary) appears to ignore the potential future changes that the route of the safeguarded M4 Relief Road could bring to this part of Newport".

The RSPB would like to make the following point in relation to this matter:-

Whilst the line of an M4 Relief Road has been safeguarded for many years, there is no certainty that the present or a future Welsh Government will pursue it. The local planning authority is reminded that possibility of an M4 Relief Road has been mooted by successive governments for approximately 28 years. A draft plan produced by the Welsh Government is currently under consultation, but the protected line is only one of three alternatives examined. Furthermore, no funding source for its construction has been secured, and no consent application applied for.

Until such time as the above matters have been resolved, it is not appropriate to cite a possible future development proposal in support of an alteration to change the settlement boundary.

It is further important to note that one of the transport-related problems identified by the Welsh Government in support of its view that congestion around the city of Newport is a serious matter is that it considers that the existing M4 has too many junctions connecting it with Newport. Indeed, one possible measure discussed in Welsh Government documentation in relation to this matter cites the closure of some existing junctions as a possible measure to reduce congestion. It is instructive to note that in the Welsh Government's current consultation, there is a proposal is to remove the motorway status of the existing M4, thus allowing the retention of its junctions.

It is inconceivable therefore that having identified the oversupply of junctions as a major contributory factor in the triggering of congestion, and suggested measures to address this, the Welsh Government would contemplate adding junctions to an M4 Relief Road.

Thus reference in the alternative site proponent's representation at paragraph 2.11 to including land between the protected line and his land holdings is unnecessary, as no motorway access at these locations would be permitted were an M4 Relief Road to be progressed. We remind the local planning authority that this land is partially within the Gwent Levels SSSI and would therefore be subject to the adverse impacts discussed elsewhere in this representation, and in previous representations by the RSPB.

Adverse Impacts on the SSSI:

The alternative site proponent addresses the issue of damage to the SSSI (at paragraph 3.5 et seq) in two ways.

1.The Role of Mitigation in Removing Adverse Impacts on the SSSI:

The alternative site proponent states: -

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

"it is considered that the inclusion of the Tata land within allocation EM1 (ii) can take full account of such constraints and issues".

However, he provides no evidence whatsoever to support this assertion. It is the view of the RSPB, garnered over many years' involvement with development on the Gwent Levels SSSI's, that significant built development and SSSI interests cannot coexist on the same site. This is borne out by evidence supplied by the Gwent Wildlife Trust to the Public Inquiry into the Newport Unitary Development Plan, as follows :-

Past Use of Planning Conditions in Respect of Planning Applications on the Gwent Levels:

The RSPB's view that the use of planning conditions and obligations cannot remove adverse impacts on the SSSI interest is supported by a 2005 desk study , which examined the efficacy of conditions imposed in respect of some major planning applications on the Gwent Levels in Newport, looking at the results of post-construction monitoring.

Construction of Distribution Depot, Associated Trailer Parks and Car Parking, etc. Approved 6th August 1993

CCW did not recommend to the then Welsh Office that the call in the application be called-in, due to a commitment on the part of the developer to the highest environmental standards being conditioned on the application by the Newport County borough Council.

Post-construction monitoring in respect of this application showed that, in spite of the imposition of conditions :-

- All surveys conducted indicate a substantial impact on the reens as a result of the development.
- The ecosystems affected displayed different rates of recovery, or no recovery at all.
- The aquatic invertebrate communities identified in the baseline survey have shown a continued decline throughout the survey period.
- These losses in abundance and diversity were a result of the construction works.

Erection of 76,000 sq m Distribution Centre with Parking, Loading, Offices, etc. Approved 26th August 1999:

Post-construction monitoring showed that, in spite of the imposition of conditions:

- The site failed to recover from a large discharge of sulphate during the early stages of the development and from other sources.
- High sulphate levels resulted in white and red algal blooms, and sulphur bacteria blooms in the reens on site, which in turn led to a reduction in the abundance and diversity of important invertebrate and plant species.
- High levels of other pollutants and poor water quality were recorded throughout the monitoring period.
- Sulphate levels in the balancing pond have stabilised at around 241 mg/l, far in excess of the 200 mg/l level deemed serious by CCW.
- pH levels remained consistently high and in excess of acceptable levels
- Since development ceased floral diversity improved marginally in some reens, while in others it decreased further.
- Very few rare or notable plant species have been recorded since development began.
- Only 2 notable aquatic/semi aquatic invertebrate species were found on site at the end of the monitoring period. And amongst the semi aquatic invertebrates there has been a substantial decrease in diversity.

We consider that there have been no material changes in circumstances since the 2005 Public Inquiry, therefore this evidence stands.

2.Reference to Text in the First Deposit Version of the LDP (April 2012):

At paragraph 3.5 the alternative site proponent states:-

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

"the wording of policy EM1 (ii) in the Deposit Version of the plan made it clear that proposals for this area would have to demonstrate that the national economic benefits of the proposals outweigh the environmental impacts, including... damage to habitats and species... within the SSSI".

However, this is erroneous, because the above text is present in the Deposit Draft Version of the LDP (April 2012), which has been superseded by the Revised Deposit Draft LDP (June 2013), from which the text cited by the alternative site proponent is wholly absent.

The alternative site proponent has not lodged a representation seeking the reinstatement of this wording in the Revised Draft LDP, therefore one must assume that he is content with it.

3.Sustainability Appraisal (Strategic Environmental Assessment):

It is instructive to note that the alternative site proponent has not carried out a Sustainability Appraisal (Strategic Environmental Assessment) pursuant to his representation in respect of Land East of Queens Way Meadows.

"If an alternative site has already been assessed as part of the authority's earlier SA of options, but a developer or owner objects to the outcome of the LPA's assessment and seeks to have that site included, it will be dealt with at the examination as an objection. It will be helpful for the proponent to demonstrate why they consider the LPA's assessment is flawed"

However, this does not appear to have been the case, and there is no evidence that the alternative site proponent has objected to the Sustainability Appraisal in respect of this site.

Paragraph 7.5.2 of the LDP Manual further states:-

"if an... alternative site has not been subject to SA, it is unlikely that the Inspector will be in a position to recommend its inclusion in the LDP".

The local planning authority is reminded that the SEA of the site at the LDP stage recommended its removal from the LDP.

4.Site Reference RAS(A) 027 only:

The alternative site proponent seeks to include land abutting the southern boundary of the Tata holding and north of the safeguarded line of an M4 Relief Road within the settlement/urban boundary on two grounds, one of which the RSPB addresses below:-

- That this in some unspecified way provides for further development in this area (apart from that portion of it which the alternative site proponent makes representation in support of its' becoming an allocation).

However, the RSPB considers that this should carry no weight because:-

The alternative site proponent does not advocate that this land becomes allocated (apart from the exception referred to above) as employment land in the LDP – merely that it is located within the settlement/urban boundary. This would render it vulnerable to environmentally damaging development outside the provisions of the LDP, because it would be "white land". This is very bad planning practice, which undermines the primacy of the development plan. Furthermore, it is predicated on the theory that proximity to a possible future M4 Relief Road would convey considerable development potential to this land. As discussed above this is very unlikely to manifest itself.

Tests of Soundness:

The RSPB considers that were the local planning authority to comply with the alternative site proponents representation, the plan would fail the following tests of soundness :-

C2: It would not have regard for national planning policy, because it would further damage to a SSSI, without proving that the need to do so clearly outweighs the harm this would result in, and because

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

of the creation of white land, and allocating land for development which is effectively beyond the plan period

CE1: It is not in conformity with the policies of the RLDP with regard to nature conservation and a realistic and achievable employment land delivery strategy

CE1: It would not be coherent, because there is no need for it

P2: The alternative site proponent has not carried out a SA/SEA in respect of it, nor objected to the SEA Environmental Report's conclusion in relation to this site and vicinity.

In the interests of consistency, the RSPB restates below its objection to the development of SSSI and UKBAP priority land covered by the alternative site proponent's representation, as follows :-

1. The alternative site is partly within the Gwent Levels SSSI, which is a statutorily designated site of national importance for nature conservation, and part of a network of national sites.
 2. NRW has identified the habitat type of the proposed allocation as Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh. This is a UK and Welsh Biodiversity Priority Habitat type for which an action plan has been written. It has also been identified by the Welsh Government as a habitat of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biological diversity, pursuant of s42 of the NERC Act.
 3. The proposed allocation would have significant and irreversible adverse impacts on the designated interest of the SSSI. These impacts will be both direct and indirect.
 4. The proposed allocation would have significant and irreversible adverse impacts on the coastal grazing marsh habitat of acknowledged importance. These impacts will be direct and indirect, and will include the physical destruction of the habitat.
5. Welsh Government policy to prioritise brownfield development over greenfield development means that it would be developed after Newport's very large brownfield land resource. Notwithstanding the question of referred to above, this would be several decades after the end of the plan period, which frustrates WG policy on the certainty and deliverability of LDPs.
- 6.
6. To allocate this site would be contrary to the following :-
- a. Section 28G of the NERC Act, which sets out the duties of the local planning authority, the Inspector, and the Welsh Government, with regard to the protection and enhancement of SSSIs
 - b. Section 42 of the NERC Act, which sets out the Welsh Government, and the local planning authority, duties in respect of the UK BAP process with regards to the coastal grazing marsh habitat of acknowledged importance for biological diversity.
 - c. Planning Policy Wales 2012, "LDP's Wales 2005", and TAN 5 (Nature Conservation) 2009, which sets out local planning authority and Welsh Government duties in respect of sustainable development, environmental protection and enhancement, statutorily designated sites of national nature conservation interest, the UK BAP and LBAP process, pollution, certainty and planning conditions and obligations.
 - d. The Revised Deposit Draft Local Development Plan, in particular its approach to sustainable development, environmental protection and enhancement, statutorily designated sites of national nature conservation importance, the UK BAP and the LBAP process, replacement habitats, use of planning conditions and obligations, pollution and SEA/SA.
 - e. The sustainability appraisal of the development plan and the strategic environmental assessment of the development plan.

Background :

The Gwent Levels:

The alternative site objected to by the RSPB falls partly within the Gwent Levels Sites of Special Scientific Interest, notified under S28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

The Gwent Levels SSSIs cover between them 5,700 ha of the Severn Estuary's northern shoreline. These contiguous SSSIs represent the largest reclaimed lowland of National importance in Wales and are ranked amongst the 5 most important habitats of this type in the United Kingdom (The Gwent Levels, Their Importance for Nature Conservation, and Commitments for their Protection Martin Wragg, 1995). The statutorily designated conservation interest is to be found associated with the extensive network of reens and drainage ditches passing through the area. This drainage network supports 25 species of locally or Nationally scarce plants and 144 locally or Nationally scarce species of invertebrates. The wide variety of habitats within the Gwent Levels provides important feeding, roosting and breeding grounds for 8 species of wintering wader, as well as supporting populations of 13 species of mammals and herptofauna protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Reens and drainage ditches crossing these lowlands form fenceless field boundaries and many of these fields are categorised as coastal grazing marsh.

Likely Significant Adverse Impacts of the Proposed Allocation on the Biodiversity Value of the Site:

The likely significant adverse impacts arising as a result of the development of the site are both direct and indirect

Direct:

•Physical destruction of the Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh (UK, Welsh and Newport Priority Habitat) through built development. It would not be possible to mitigate for this adverse impact

•Physical destruction of the reens SSSI notified interest through built development. It would not be possible to mitigate for this adverse impact.

Indirect:

Eutrophication: Landscaping would be required as part of the development. This would involve tree-planting. Leaf fall would cause eutrophication of the reens, (SSSI feature) which would significantly adversely impact on water quality. The flora and fauna of the reens rely on very high water quality, and are very sensitive to falls in quality. Please see assessments of a sample of post-construction monitoring studies carried out pursuant to planning conditions in respect of consented application for more information in respect of this matter. It would not be possible to enforce a planning condition in relation to this matter.

Chemical Pollution of Reen Interest: Hydrocarbon runoff from hard surfacing, and diffuse pollution from herbicides, pesticides and insecticides associated with maintenance of developments. It would not be possible to frame a planning condition or obligation, or enforce them, in relation to this matter, because inter alia it would not be possible to isolate individual sources of such pollution, or to stop them from entering the hydrological system, upon which the SSSI and Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh interest depends.

Blocking of Management of Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh (UK, Wales and Newport Priority Habitat) and Reens (SSSI): In the interests of health and safety, development would be likely to block access on the part of the machinery which is required to operate in or in close proximity to Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh and reens.

Water Level Fluctuations: Fluctuations in water level during and following development can have profound effects on invertebrate populations. This is especially so when ditches are temporarily drained to allow construction, and as a result of rapid runoff from impervious surfaces such as car and lorry parks. As the site is located within the floodplain, and requires a Strategic Flood Consequences Assessment, drainage would be required to develop the site.

National and Local Policy Context:

Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

The Council has a duty in respect of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) under (hereafter referred to as the CROW Act). This duty affects the weight the Council should give to the conservation and enhancement of SSSIs in exercising its statutory planning functions, including the preparation of development plans and relevant proposals for land-use allocations.

The following are section 28G authorities-

- (a) A Minister of the Crown (within the meaning of the Ministers of the Crown Act 1975) or a Government department;
- (b) The Welsh Government (hereafter referred to as the WG) and an Inspector appointed by the WG
- (c) A local authority;

Paragraph 45 of the Assembly's Circular 31/2001 (Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000) makes it clear that the section 28G duty applies whenever a local authority is exercising its functions.

"45.New section 28G, inserted in the 1981 Act, imposes an important new duty on public bodies, exercising statutory functions that may affect SSSIs, to take reasonable steps, consistent with the proper exercise of these functions, to further the conservation and enhancement of the features for which the site is of special interest. Public bodies specifically include local authorities and the duty applies wherever they are exercising their functions. The Welsh Government expects public bodies to apply strict tests when carrying out functions within or affecting SSSIs, to ensure that they minimise adverse effects, and to adopt the highest standards of management in relation to SSSIs that they own." (emphasis added)

Para 5.4.3 of PPW states :-

"This duty applies to the Welsh Ministers, Ministers of the Crown, local planning authorities, statutory undertakers and any other public body"

From this guidance, it is clear that in preparing its new LDP the local planning authority should have:

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

- “Taken all reasonable steps to ensure it conserved and enhanced all of the SSSIs within its area;
- In identifying potential land-use allocations, favouring those that would avoid adverse effects on SSSIs;
- Applied strict tests to any land-use allocations that could damage an SSSI to ensure that adverse effects could be mitigated in full in order to avoid such damage;
- If land-use allocations were to be pursued that were likely to cause damage to SSSIs (even with mitigation) that such damage could be fully justified i.e. it should clearly override the national importance of the SSSI and the Council had no less damaging alternative sites available to meet the identified need, and
- That appropriate habitat compensation could be provided for any likely damage to a SSSI likely to arise from such an allocation and that proper provision was made in the plan policy for such compensation to ensure that the interest of the SSSI network was conserved”

(emphasis added)

Were the local planning authority to allocate this site, it would not have taken all reasonable steps to ensure it conserved and enhanced all of the SSSIs within its area. It would have failed to apply strict tests to any landuse allocations that could damage a SSSI , and would have failed to show that adverse effects cannot be adequately mitigated or compensated for. It would have thus failed to set out how, in its view, the proposed allocation clearly override the national importance of the SSSI, failed to identify need, and failed to show conclusively that it had no less damaging alternative sites.

The UK, Welsh and Newport Biodiversity Processes , and s42 and s41(3) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

Over and above its designation of an SSSI, the site of the proposed allocation consists of Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh, which is a Priority Habitat under the UK and Welsh Biodiversity processes for which a Habitat Action Plan (hereafter referred to as HAP) has been produced at the UK and Newport levels, and is in preparation at the Welsh level. Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh is also placed on a list pursuant of section 42 of the NERC Act , as being considered by the Welsh Government as being of principal importance for the purpose of the conservation of biological diversity.

Paragraph 5.2.2 of PPW states that the NERC Act places a duty on local planning authorities (and the WG) to take (and to encourage others to take) reasonably practicable steps to further the conservation (including restoration and enhancement) of Priority Habitat types. The selection criteria for Priority Habitat types are that they must be habitats for which the UK has international obligations, habitats at risk, such as those with a high rate of decline, especially over the last 20 years or which are rare, habitats which may be functionally critical and habitats which are important for Priority Species

The RSPB is of the view that to reject this alternative site would be to take a reasonably practicable step to further the conservation of this habitat type, which is of acknowledged importance. This duty applies to the WG itself.

The Newport Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh HAP cites eutrophication as a primary, widespread threat, and industrialisation and urbanisation as localised threats. The RSPB concurs with this, considers that allocation of the alternative site would result in eutrophication. The RSPB concurs with the HAP that industrialisation and urbanisation, as exemplified by this proposed allocation is a threat to Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh.

Planning Policy Wales 2012

Sustainable Development and Planning Policy Wales 2012:

Paragraph 1.4.3 of Planning Policy Wales 2012 (hereafter referred to a PPW) states that the Welsh Government has a specific duty regarding sustainable development, namely that “it the (WG) promotes sustainable development”, via the s79 of the Government of Wales Act 2006.

Paragraph 1.4.3 further states that this duty has implications for the planning system.

It is the thus the view of the RSPB that the WG duty in relation to sustainable development set out in the Government of Wales Act must be addressed through inter alia the town and country planning system in Wales, and that to allocate this alternative site, which would have a material adverse impact on statutorily designated sites of national nature conservation importance a UK Biodiversity Priority Habitat would be counter to sustainable development, and thus to the Government of Wales Act 1998.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Paragraph 4.1.4. of PPW, in setting out how the Welsh Government promotes sustainable development, states that it is:-

“placing sustainability at the heart of its decision making processes” (Bullet Point1).

In respect of the Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh Priority Habitat, para 5.4.2 of PPW states that the town and country planning system in Wales must :-

“forge and strengthen links between the town and country planning system and biodiversity action planning particularly through policies in local development plans”

It is the view of the RSPB that this emphasis on promoting sustainable development through decision-making means that the alternative site allocation should not be allocated in the LDP.

The Environmental Element of Sustainable Development

Paragraph 4.4.1 states that WG's key policy objectives should be taken into account in the preparation of LDPs.

The WG's principles in relation to sustainable development, as set out in paragraph 4.1.2 of PPW, elucidates the environmental element of sustainable development, through stating in Bullet Point 4 that environmental limits will be respected. The RSPB considers that were this allocation to be permitted, environmental limits would not be respected.

Paragraph 4.4.2 (Bullet Point 7) cites planning as a key policy tool contributing to the protection and improvement of the environment so as to protect local and global ecosystems. In particular planning should “seek to ensure that development does not produce irreversible harmful effects on the natural environment”. Bullet Point 7 further cites as an objective the conservation and enhancement of statutorily designated sites and the conservation of biodiversity.

Chapter 5 of PPW contains the WG's planning policy relating to conserving and improving natural heritage.

Statutorily Designated Sites:

Paragraph 5.1.2 (Bullet Point 3) states the WG's objectives in relation to this matter include ensuring that statutorily designated sites are properly protected. It is the RSPB's view that the Gwent Levels, as a statutorily designated site should be protected from damaging development.

Paragraph 5.3.2 states that regard should be had to the relative significance of international, national, and local designations when considering the weight to be attached to nature conservation interests. As the Gwent Levels SSSI is designated at the national level and therefore towards the top of the hierarchy, the RSPB is of the view that significant weight should be attached to this proposed allocation, which would have a material adverse impact upon them.

Paragraph 5.3.1 states that statutorily designated sites make a vital contribution to protecting biodiversity. The RSPB concurs with this.

Paragraph 5.3.9 of PPW states that the WG will ensure that statutorily designated sites (of which the Gwent Levels SSSI is one) are protected against damage and deterioration (consistent with the objectives of the designation). The RSPB considers that to permit this proposed allocation would be to fail to comply with this requirement.

Para 5.2 of PPW further states that:-

“local planning authorities should further the conservation of habitats of principal importance through their planning function”

This strengthens the materiality of the need to protect this habitat via the LDP.

A further principle, as set out in Bullet Point 8 of para 4.3.1. states that pollution should be prevented as far as possible and that the polluter pays for damage resulting from pollution. The RSPB considers that eutrophication of the SSSI ree interest which is likely to occur as a result of the development of their proposed allocation is a form of pollution.

Supplementary Planning Guidance “Wildlife and Development” 2010:

Section 3, Bullet Point 4 (page 6) of the Supplementary Planning Guidance “Wildlife and Development” 2010 states :-

“The Council has an obligation to protect (legally protected sites) as part of the planning process”

The RSPB considers that to delete this site would be in conformity with his obligation.

Table 1 (page 8) of the SPG states that, in relating to nationally important designated sites, there is a :-

“Strong presumption against damaging development”

As the RSPB considers that the development of this site would be damaging, the Council would, if it wishes to allocate the site, have to surmount this strong presumption. The RSPB considers that it has failed to do so.

The Brownfield Test:

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

Para 4.8.1 of PPW states :-

"Previously developed (or brownfield) land should, wherever possible, be used in preference to greenfield sites, particularly those of high ecological value"

The SSSI designation, and UK, Wales and Newport Biodiversity Priority Habitat classification of the Gwent Levels shows that they are of high ecological value, and the fact that there is no need for the proposed allocation shows that it is possible to use brownfield land in preference.

Policy SP1 of the Revised Deposit Draft LDP (criterion (ii)) states :-

PROPOSALS WILL BE REQUIRED TO MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT BY CONCENTRATING DEVELOPMENT IN SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS ON BROWNFIELD LAND WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY. THEY WILL BE ASSESSED AS TO THEIR POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO:

- i) THE EFFICIENT USE OF LAND;
- ii) THE REUSE OF PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND AND EMPTY PROPERTIES IN PREFERENCE TO GREENFIELD SITES;

The RSPB supports this policy, and furthermore believes that with the largest brownfield resource in Wales, it is possible to act in conformity with it.

Paragraph 1.21 of "LDP's Wales 2006" states: -

"it is important that proposals are... likely to be implemented during the plan period".

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the RSPB is firmly of the view that to allocate this alternative site , which would have significant adverse effects on a statutorily designated site of national nature conservation interest and on a threatened habitat of acknowledged importance, would be contrary to national and local planning policy and good practice, and to UK and Welsh legislation relating to the Welsh Government's duties in relation to sustainable development, the protection of the environment, protection and enhancement of SSSI's and the protection of UK, Welsh and Newport BAP and s42 priority habitats.

It would further be in conflict with established and widely recognised good planning practice in terms of environmental assessment, the resourceful use of land, and the use of supplementary planning guidance.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

I would like to speak about the adverse impacts on the SSSI and on the wider planning policy aspects of the alternative site proponent's case

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1420.K1 | Corus UK Ltd / Tata Steel UK Ltd | GVA Grimley | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | I | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 562/ East of Queensway Meadows

Summary: Additional support to include East of Queensway Meadows within the settlement boundary

Item Question Representation Text

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

1. Introduction and Context

1.1 This statement has been prepared by GVA on behalf of Tata Steel UK Ltd (Tata Steel) in response to the Alternative Site Register Consultation (Revised LDP stage). This statement accompanies the relevant completed Alternative Sites Consultation Response Form(s) and should be read in conjunction with all previous representations made to the LDP process on behalf of Tata Steel.

1.2 To a large extent, this statement reiterates the representations made to the Deposit Version of the Plan back in July 2012 (Doc Ref: GVA/07A816677/DLDP) in addition to those made at Revised Deposit Plan stage in July 2013 (Doc Ref: GVA/07A816677/RDLP), which demonstrated the significant opportunity that the Tata Steel landholdings at Llanwern present. Nevertheless, it is evident that the Council has not accounted for our representations in its Alternative Sites Consultation – this is extremely disappointing.

1.3 Whilst we continue to welcome the partial allocation of the Tata Steel landholdings within the Revised Deposit Plan under Policy EM2(ii), we note that Tata Steel's remaining landholdings continue to remain outside the settlement boundary. Additionally, we also note that the settlement boundary as illustrated on the Revised Deposit Proposals Map (East) does not accurately reflect the position of the SSSI boundary as illustrated on the Revised Deposit Constraints Map.

1.4 It is in this context that we respond to the Alternative Site Register to re-emphasise the rationale of our previous submissions and representation. Put simply, it is not logical to exclude operational industrial land from the settlement boundary.

1.5 It is our view that without the changes sought in these representations, the Revised Deposit LDP continues to fail the following Tests of Soundness:

- CE1 – as the plan will not comprise a coherent strategy from which its policies and allocations can logically flow;
- CE2 – as the policies, and in particular allocations, are not realistic and do not fully consider the relevant alternatives and all credible evidence; and
- CE4 – in that the plan will not be flexible enough to deal with changing circumstances over the plan period – particularly in respect of the Tata Steel land at Llanwern which will be at the centre of transformation associated with the East Newport Expansion.

1.6 We set out below our detailed representations, together with the alterations and amendments required to make the LDP sound.

2. Amendment to Settlement Boundary

2.1 As detailed in the introduction above, we continue to welcome the allocation of part of the Tata Steel owned land at Llanwern under Policy EM2 (ii), as identified on the Proposals Map - East. As highlighted in our previous representations (Doc Ref: GVA/07A816677/RDLP), this positive allocation clearly recognises the development potential of Tata Steel's land and how it can positively contribute to the regeneration of this strategically important gateway location. It is our view, however, that the allocation does not go far enough in that it excludes a large proportion of the operated land. This allocation, described in the Revised Deposit Plan as 'Llanwern Former Tipping Area South of Queensway', identifies 122 hectares of land to provide for B1, B2 and B8 uses.

2.2 Notwithstanding this, it is evident that our previous detailed representations requesting amendment to the settlement boundary to include the remainder of our client's land has been overlooked. Our client's operational land in this area extends to approximately 343ha.

2.3 Importantly, previous representations outlined in greater detail the significance of including the Tata Steel land-holding south of Queensway given that it is part of the operational area of the site. A site plan is included at Appendix 1 and identifies the full extent of Tata Steel's land at this location. It is the area shown on this plan, south of Queensway, that we consider needs to be included within the settlement boundary for Newport (in addition to the operational land north of Queensway).

2.4 The exclusion from the urban development limits of an area of land that continues to form part of our client's operations is unacceptable and we object to the Alternative Site as identified in the register on this basis.

2.5 As previously emphasised, we consider that such a situation ignores the historic context to this part of our client's land and operations, as well as its current physical condition and use. We reiterate that the treatment of our client's land in this manner also appears to ignore the potential future changes that the route of the safeguarded M4 relief road could bring to this part of Newport.

2.6 As previously outlined in representations (Doc Ref: GVA/07A816677/RDLP), the Tata Steel owned land that continues to be excluded from the defined development limits comprises the reed bed system that, forms an integral and important part of the operational steelworks site at Llanwern. Simply put, the steelworks is reliant on the continued use of this system to discharge, and treat, all surface water and foul sewage produced by the works. The reed bed area at Greenmore, to the south of Queensway, is therefore part of the industrial operations that take place at the site, and should be included within the urban boundary. We therefore consider this a substantial argument in seeking amendment to the LDP settlement boundary as currently proposed through the Alternative Sites Consultation.

2.7 We also consider it necessary to reiterate that the treatment of Tata Steel's land in this area in the Revised Deposit LDP is not consistent with the position established in the current adopted UDP. The adopted UDP allocates the majority of the land to the south of Queensway within the urban development limits of the UDP.

2.8 Importantly, we acknowledge the designation of the SSSI within this area and emphasise that the inclusion of Tata Steel's remaining land would not impact on the special qualities of this area given that the inclusion of such land within the settlement area would be protected by the SSSI designation regardless.

2.9 In light of this, we contend that the LDP urban boundary should be amended in line with our previous submissions and representations as outlined above. We reiterate that there appears to be no justification for the realignment of these urban limits established in the Revised Deposit LDP. For the same reasons that we consider the land should be included within the urban boundary, we also consider it should be excluded from the Special Landscape Area and Undeveloped Coastal Zone designations in the LDP.

2.10 Additionally, and notwithstanding our position that all of our client's land should be within the urban boundary, we note that the Revised Proposals Map (East) settlement boundary does not

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K71 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 562/ East of Queensway Meadows

Summary: Objection to the proposed amendments

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

East of Queensway Meadows

The proposed amendment to the boundary of land allocated under Revised Deposit LDP Policy EM1(ii) would extend the area allocated for employment use into an area notified as the Gwent Levels – Nash and Goldcliff SSSI. Any development within this amended boundary is likely to lead to the direct loss or damage of the SSSI. This proposed change is therefore inconsistent with the Revised LDP's objective to protect and enhance the natural environment.

We recommend that proposed amendment is not accepted, and would remind you of your authority's duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with your authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reasons of which the site is of special interest.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

4 4 Additional Material

*For Greenfield allocations: Contrary to test of soundness P2, CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation on a Greenfield site is contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP) Strategy to favour the use of brownfield land and buildings over the development of greenfield land.

If it is intended to include proposals in the LDP that clearly conflict with the objectives of the Newport Deposit Local Development Plan 2011-2026, there should be clear justification as to why such an approach is being taken.

For any sites within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, Gwent Levels:

Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, Gwent Levels: St. Brides: Contrary to test of soundness C2

P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is within the Gwent Levels: Rumney and Peterstone SSSI/ Gwent

Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI / Gwent Levels: St. Brides and has potential to lead to further loss and/or degradation of habitat. It also has the potential to have adverse implications for the management of the drainage system that supports the features of the SSSI. The impacts of a development are not restricted to the actual site itself but can affect the wider area of the SSSI, given the interconnected nature of the drainage system and the way it is managed.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should not be included in the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI.

In addition to the harm to the SSSI likely to be caused by this allocation, we also have concerns about the long term development of the site, given its location below mean high water mark and being dependent on the long term maintenance of flood defences. We have serious concerns about the appropriateness and longer term sustainability of allocating development in such areas.

~For any sites in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI: Contrary to test of soundness C2 P2 CE1, CE2,

This proposed allocation is in proximity to Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI and has potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, and also to have implications for the management features of the SSSI.

Langstone – Llanmartin Meadows SSSI is notified for its marshy grassland, early-marsh orchid and fragrant orchid. Development at this site has the potential to lead to loss and/or degradation of habitat, through linkages to the SSSI via interconnected drainage through the stream and drains. Any development at this site will therefore need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on the SSSI for example via site drainage of an inappropriate quality and ensuring the existing sewerage system has capacity for additional loading. The sewer runs through the SSSI and in the past has blocked and over flowed on to the SSSI adversely increasing nutrient loading. In addition, NCC must satisfy themselves that the allocation of this site would not cause increased physical disturbance eg from people, dogs and horses, to the nearby fragile SSSI habitat. Proposals will need to demonstrate how potential adverse impacts on the SSSI have been avoided or mitigated.

We therefore remind you of your authority's SSSI duty under Section 28G of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act, as amended, to take reasonable steps consistent with you authority's functions to further the conservation and enhancement of the features by reason of which the site is of special interest, and advise that the allocation should be deleted from the plan as it is likely to cause further deterioration to the SSSI. Should it be decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the supporting text to the policy should require applications for development to be accompanied by sufficient information to enable the impacts on the SSSI to be fully assessed, and to demonstrate how the proposals have avoided or minimised/mitigated any impacts on the SSSI.

^For sites with known potential for EPS:

The site contains habitat with the potential for EPS (or known records of EPS). We therefore draw your attention to the need to consider this potential/European Protected Species should you be minded to include the site or amended boundary within the LDP.

We remind you of your duties toward European Species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended. Where a European Protected species (EPS) is present and a development proposal is likely to contravene the protection afforded to EPS, development may only proceed under a licence issued by the Welsh Government (WG), having satisfied three requirements set out in the legislation. One of these requires that the development authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range.

We therefore advise that if it is decided to allocate the site in the LDP, the text supporting the allocation should require an appropriate species survey, and mitigation if required, to accompany any

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

planning application for the development of the site to ensure the proposal does not result in any likely detriment to the favourable conservation status of the species.

+For sites located within Zone C1:

TAN15 (Section 10) is clear, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation".

An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed. Evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative site in Zone C are acceptable.

++ For sites located within Zone C2:

We refer to advice given in Sections 9 (Summary of Policy Requirements) and comments made in Section 10.8 of TAN15, which states that "sites in zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 6.2."

In addition, no evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new alternative use/site in Zone C2 would be acceptable. If this site is to be considered, despite the policy presumption against highly vulnerable development in Zone C2, evidence, which should be up to date, must demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed over the lifetime of development (in accordance with Section 7 and Appendix 1 of TAN15). TAN15 (Section 10.5) is clear in this regard, "allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development/use has to be located there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. The local planning authority "will need to fully explain and justify the reasons for allocating a site within Zone C in the relevant reasoned justification for the allocation". An allocation should not be made if the consequences of a flooding event, over the lifetime of the development, cannot be effectively managed.

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 3993.K2 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | M |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 562/ East of Queensway Meadows

Summary: Support the amendments suggested for East of Queensway Meadows.

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(A)031 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name East of Queensway Meadows |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | Representation Many thanks for this information. |
|---|---|---|

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4128.K13 | Newport CC Conservation & Listed Buildings | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 562/ East of Queensway Meadows

Summary: Historic environment comments on East of Queensway Meadows.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(A)031

2 2 Alternative Site Name
East of Queensway Meadows

3 3 Representation
These sites include a grade II listed building (17543 - Tatton Farm). Development to the western end of these sites is likely to adversely affect the rural setting of the farmhouse.

Site,RepnType: 563/ Roman Lodge Hotel,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1199.K5 | Giles, Clr Gail | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|---------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 563/ Roman Lodge Hotel

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of the Roman Lodge Hotel residential development from the Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
I support application
RAS(D)015 - Roman Lodge Hotel - Delete Housing Commitment allocation.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3993.K3 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 563/ Roman Lodge Hotel

Summary: Agree with the suggested alteration to Roman Lodge Hotel, Caerleon.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)015

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Roman Lodge Hotel, Caerleon.

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 564/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 42.K7 | Graig Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 564/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of cycleway at Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Also, my Council strongly objects to any alterations being made to the following five sites in the Graig Ward (logged against of the 5 sites).

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 583.K2 | Cornelious, Cllr Mrs Margaret | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 564/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of long distance walk/cycleway allocation at Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

This is a beautiful and safe area for people to walk and cycle. The surrounding roads, Forge Lane, M4 and Bassaleg Road, are not safe areas (not allowed on M4) especially for family's with young children. Government policy encourages exercise, and this is a very safe place for families with young children to use. I object strongly to the deletion of walk/cycleway.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

3276.K7 and Family, Peter Symes

06/09/2013

E

M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 564/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Object to proposed deletion at Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to all the proposed additions, amendments, and Deletions especially the proposed changes to the old Tredegar Park Golf course site.

I realise that the site owners will always have an eye for a chance to renege on their previously-agreed commitments but they have no firm grounds to wriggle out of these environmental conditions rightly imposed when planning permission was granted (unfortunately) in the first place.

Nothing has changed in the interim except there is an even greater need to protect the environment in Graig and ensure we have some green space and places to walk safely.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3663.K29 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 564/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Objection to the proposed deletion

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)019 Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

The proposed footpath/cycleway through the former golf course is under discussion with the sites developer in relation to a Section 106 Agreement. Whilst the proposed route may differ from that shown the principle of connecting the M4 access, via subway, with Golden Mile View and Park view is still valid. This allocation must, therefore, remain.

3993.K4 Feeney, Mrs A

10/09/2013 E S M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 564/ Former Tredegar Park Golf Course

Summary: Agree with the proposed deletion at the Former Tredegar Golf Course

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(D)019

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Former Tredegar Golf Course

3 3 Representation

Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 565/ Tredegar Street,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 42.K8 | Graig Community Council | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 565/ Tredegar Street

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of Environmental Space at Tredegar Street

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Also, my Council strongly objects to any alterations being made to the following five sites in the Graig Ward (logges against each of the 5 sites).

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 583.K1 | Cornelious, Cllr Mrs Margaret | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 565/ Tredegar Street

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of environmental space allocation at Tredegar Street

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

This small area of land has been a childrens play area for many years, and should remain as such. There is no other space for youngsters to play in a safe environment within the village curtilage.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 694.K7 | Caston, Mr R J | | | 27/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |
|---------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 565/ Tredegar Street

Summary: Objects to deletion of allocation for environmental space

| Item Question | Representation Text | |
|---------------|---------------------|--|
|---------------|---------------------|--|

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)020 | |
|-----|--|--|

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar Street, Rhiwderin | |
|-----|---|--|

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 3 3 | Representation I object to the deletion of the environmental space allocation here. It was the site of a toddlers play area, very conveniently situated to local housing and nursery facilities, and should be reinstated. | |
|-----|---|--|

| | | |
|-----|---------------------|--|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | |
|-----|---------------------|--|

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|-----|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 742.K2 | Smith, Mr G D | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|---------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 565/ Tredegar Street

Summary: Object to the proposed deletion at Tredegar Street

| Item Question | Representation Text | |
|---------------|---------------------|--|
|---------------|---------------------|--|

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D) 020 | |
|-----|---|--|

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name Tredegar Street Rhiwderin | |
|-----|--|--|

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 3 3 | Representation Tredegar Street, Rhiwderin. This area is a playground for young children. To remove this and build over the site will just make the lack of facilities in the area even worse, and young sters will be forced into playing on the streets, with the dangers that that presents, particularly with the extra traffic that will be generated. | |
|-----|---|--|

| | | |
|-----|---------------------|----|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | No |
|-----|---------------------|----|

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|-----|---|----|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3276.K8 | and Family, Peter Symes | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 565/ Tredegar Street

Summary: Object to proposed deletion at Tredegar Street, Rhiwderin

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I object to all the proposed additions, amendments, and Deletions especially the proposed changes to the old Tredegar Park Golf course site.

I realise that the site owners will always have an eye for a chance to renege on their previously-agreed commitments but they have no firm grounds to wriggle out of these environmental conditions rightly imposed when planning permission was granted (unfortunately) in the first place.

Nothing has changed in the interim except there is an even greater need to protect the environment in Graig and ensure we have some green space and places to walk safely.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3993.K5 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2012 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 565/ Tredegar Street

Summary: Support the proposed deletion at Tredegar Street.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(D)020

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Tredegar Street

3 3 Representation

Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 566/ Woodlands Site,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3507.K14 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 566/ Woodlands Site

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of housing proposal at Woodlands Site, Ringland from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
We do not support this deletion.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3683.K72 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 566/ Woodlands Site

Summary: Support the deletion

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Woodlands Site, Ringland
We welcome the proposed deletion to avoid loss of woodland and semi-natural habitats and to safeguard habitat connectivity.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3993.K6 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 566/ Woodlands Site

Summary: Agree with the suggested deletion at Woodlands Sites, Ringland.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)004

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Woodlands Sites, Ringland

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 567/ Gwent Europark,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3683.K73 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 567/ Gwent Europark

Summary: Support the proposed deletion

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Gwent Europark
Due to the location within the Gwent Levels –
Redwick and Llandevenney SSSI, we welcome the
proposed deletion of this site.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3993.K7 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 567/ Gwent Europark

Summary: Agree with the proposed deletion at Gwent Europark

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)021

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Gwent Europark

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 568/ Former Pirelli,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3993.K8 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 568/ Former Pirelli

Summary: Agree with the removal the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)006

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Pirelli

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 569/ 254 Cromwell Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3993.K9 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 569/ 254 Cromwell Road

Summary: Support the deletion of the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)008

2 2 Alternative Site Name
254 Cromwell Road

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 570/ Frobisher Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3993.K10 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 570/ Frobisher Road

Summary: Support the deletion of the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)009

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Frobisher Road

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 571/ Solutia,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3683.K74 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 571/ Solutia

Summary: Support the proposed deletion of site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
Solutia
Due to the location in proximity to the Gwent Levels
– Nash and Goldcliff SSSI, we welcome the
proposed deletion of this site.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3993.K11 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 571/ Solutia

Summary: Support the deletion of the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)023

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Solutia

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 572/ Coedkernew Railway Station,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 47.K12 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 572/ Coedkernew Railway Station

Summary: Object to the proposed deletion of the Coedkernew Railway Station

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Sites Proposed for deletion from the LDP RAS(D)002 Coedkernew Railway Station Proposed Deletion – Delete Railway Station Allocation We object in principle to the deletion of the proposal to site a new train station at Coedkernew. The presence of such a station would assist in easing the already overburdened road infrastructure in the area, an issue again being reviewed as part of the alternative M4 route south of Newport now being discussed and recently opened to public scrutiny. A station at this site would assist local business in respect of the workforce and also the community in making travel easier between the immediate area and the larger conurbations of Cardiff and Newport and indeed through links, to a much wider geographical area serviced by the rail network as a whole. A local station would assist in encouraging development of the business community in the Coedkernew area and assist in the development of the site already established at Celtic Way and the proposed extension for the Duffryn Employment site also commented upon in reference RAS(D)005. The station would be of benefit to the local community not only in Duffryn but also directly to the residents of Marshfield and Castleton where public transport is already severely limited. The development of a train station at this site would be of benefit to both business and social life in the immediate area and be conducive to growth and prosperity.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

1600.K14 White, Cllr Richard

15/10/2013 E O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 572/ Coedkernew Railway Station

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of the site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(D)002

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Coedkernew Railway Station

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)002

The construction of a railway station at Coedkernew is part of the SEWTA transport strategy. Combined with a Park and ride facility it will fulfil a need for the west of the City as well as the adjacent businesses. It should not be deleted from the LDP although the position indicated on the plan is probably not the best.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K13 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 572/ Coedkernew Railway Station

Summary: Objection to the proposed deletion of site from the Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)002

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Coedkernew Railway Station

3 3 Representation
Deletion – Delete Railway Station Allocation

Opposed.

The presence of such a station would assist in easing the already overburdened road infrastructure in the area, an issue again being reviewed as part of the alternative M4 route south of Newport now being discussed and recently opened to public scrutiny.

A station at this site would assist local business in respect of the workforce and also the community in making travel easier between the immediate area and the larger conurbations of Cardiff and Newport and indeed through links, to a much wider geographical area serviced by the rail network as a whole.

A local station would assist in encouraging development of the business community in the Coedkernew area and assist in the development of the site already established at Celtic Way and the proposed extension for the Duffryn Employment site also commented upon in reference RAS(D)005.

The station would be of benefit to the local community not only in Duffryn but also directly to the residents of Marshfield and Castleton where public transport is already severely limited.

The development of a train station at this site would be of benefit to both business and social life in the immediate area and be conducive to growth and prosperity.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3663.K30 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 572/ Coedkernew Railway Station

Summary: Objection to the proposed deletion

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)002 Coedkernew Railway Station

A Railway Station east of Newport on the Great Western Relief Line has been identified as essential in both the Sewta Rail Strategy and emerging South East Wales Metro. Whilst the exact location is to be determined during Network Rails GRIP process, project management procedure, Coedkernew is the preferred option. This allocation must, therefore remain.

3683.K75 Natural Resources Wales

18/10/2013 E M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 572/ Coedkernew Railway Station

Summary: Support the proposed deletion of site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

Coedkernew Train Station

Due to the location within the Gwent Levels – St Brides SSSI, we welcome the proposed deletion of this site.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3692.K6 | Lawrence, Tracey | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 572/ Coedkernew Railway Station

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)002

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Coedkernew Train Station

3 3 Representation

I request that the development of Coedkernew train station remains within the LDP as a significant progress and improve transport links in and around Newport and the major business parks in west Newport.

This would assist current congestion issues on the M4 as local traffic can avoid major peak travel times on M4 and into the city centre.

Minimal impact on local wildlife and considerate building should be explored should this proposal progress to minimise impact on wetlands areas.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

3849.K15 Suller, Cllr Tom

18/10/2013 E O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 572/ Coedkernew Railway Station

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of Coedkernew Railway Station from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)002

The construction of a railway station at Coedkernew is part of the SEWTA transport strategy. Combined with a Park and ride facility it will fulfil a need for the west of the City as well as the adjacent businesses. It should not be deleted from the LDP although the position indicated on the plan is probably not the best.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3993.K12 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 572/ Coedkernew Railway Station

Summary: Support the deletion of the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)002

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Coedkernew Train Station

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 573/ Percoed Reen School,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3507.K15 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|----------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 573/ Percoed Reen School

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of Percoed Reen School from the Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
We do not support this deletion.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3683.K76 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 573/ Percoed Reen School

Summary: Support the proposed deletion

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
 Percoed Reen School Site
 Due to the location within the Gwent Levels – Sit
 Brides SSSI, we welcome the proposed deletion of
 this site.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3993.K13 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 573/ Percoed Reen School

Summary: Support the deletion of the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
 RAS(D)003

2 2 Alternative Site Name
 Percoed Reen School Site

3 3 Representation
 Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 574/ Duffryn Employment Site,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 47.K13 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 574/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Object to the proposed deletion of the Duffryn Employment Site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)005 Duffryn Employment Site Proposed Deletion – Delete Employment Site Allocation Marshfield Community Council would object in principle to the deletion of the proposal for the development of the Duffryn employment site. The site is adjacent to the Imperial Park development and is serviced by a road infrastructure that is already in place. The immediate area is already the subject of industrial use and as such further development would not be out of character with that already existing in the vicinity. The development would aid in bringing much needed business development to an area already designated for such use. Use of the site for employment purposes would complement the development of a train station being sited at Coedkernew as per the proposed deletion reference RAS(D)002 which is also opposed by MCC.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

1600.K15 White, Cllr Richard

15/10/2013 E O M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 574/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of the site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(D)005

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Duffryn Employment Site

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)005

The allocation to employment use should remain as it would compliment the proposed station and is a natural extension to the existing business area.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3508.K14 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 574/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Objection to the proposed deletion of site from the Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)005 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Duffryn Employment Site | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed Deletion – Delete Employment Site Allocation Opposed. The site is adjacent to the Imperial Park development and is serviced by a road infrastructure that is already in place. The immediate area is already the subject of industrial use and as such further development would not be out of character with that already existing in the vicinity. The development would aid in bringing much needed business development to an area already designated for such use. Use of the site for employment purposes would complement the development of a train station being sited at Coedkernew as per the proposed deletion reference RAS(D)002 which is also opposed by MCC. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K77 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 574/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Support the proposed deletion

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
 Duffryn Employment Site
 Due to the location within the Gwent Levels – St
 Brides SSSI, we welcome the proposed deletion of
 this site.

3849.K16 Suller, Cllr Tom

18/10/2013 E O M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 574/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of Duffryn Employment Site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
 RAS(D)005
 The allocation to employment use should remain as it would compliment the proposed station and is a natural extension to the existing business area.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3861.K5 | Cassidian Limited | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 574/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Objection to the proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)005 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Duffryn Employment Site | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Cassidian Limited objects to the proposal to delete the current LDP allocation of this site as an Employment Area, for the following reasons: 1. This would be sacrificing valuable space in what has been set out as an Employment Area on the Local Development Plan. The area undoubtedly is "prestigious land which has good access to transport links". 2. In light of Newport's current unemployment situation (especially taking into account the high rate of unemployment in the area's 18-24 age group), the protection of the City's potentially high employment areas, is undoubtedly at the top of the Council's agenda. Accordingly, Cassidian objects to any decision the Council takes to change land use in an already proven industrial development area. Any alternative use of land at Duffryn would also restrict expansion opportunities for existing local businesses and those located further afield. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3993.K14 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 574/ Duffryn Employment Site

Summary: Support the deletion of the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)005

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Duffryn Employment Site

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

Site,RepnType: 575/ Celtic Way,

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 47.K14 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|--------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Support the proposed deletion of the Gypsy and Traveller Site at Celtic Way

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)027 Celtic Way Gypsy and Traveller Transit Site Proposed Deletion – Delete Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Allocation We support the deletion of the gypsy and traveller transit allocation for the following reasons: The proposed site is located adjacent to a prestigious industrial park, owned by the Welsh Government, which is actively being promoted to attract new businesses, revenues and job opportunities to the Newport area. The proposed site is also adjacent to a thriving residential area, Celtic Horizons. Marshfield Community Council believes that inclusion of a transit gypsy and traveller site at this location would deter new businesses from being attracted to the industrial park, thus thwarting future local employment and revenue prospects. In addition, we believe that this would also increase the risk of existing businesses pulling out of the industrial park, thus damaging existing employment and revenues for the Newport area. In addition to local business impact, Marshfield Community Council is concerned about the effect on local housing and the local population. The Celtic Horizons residential area has good reputation and continues to attract families to the area. We believe that inclusion of a transit gypsy and traveller site at the proposed location would deter people from buying in the area and potentially cause families to leave the area, resulting in erosion of the local community.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1600.K16 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Support for proposed deletion of the site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(D)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Celtic Way

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)027

Although the provision of a transit site would solve the problem of illegal encampments in the area this site should be deleted from the plan as it has the potential to have a harmful effect on the established and future business use in the area

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3508.K15 | Evans, Ms Kirstie | | | 02/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed the deletion of site from Revised LDP

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Proposed Deletion – Delete Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Allocation Support deletion. The proposed site is located adjacent to a prestigious industrial park, owned by the Welsh Government, which is actively being promoted to attract new businesses, revenues and job opportunities to the Newport area. The proposed site is also adjacent to a thriving residential area, Celtic Horizons. I believe that locating a transit gypsy and traveller site at this location would deter new businesses from being attracted to the industrial park, thus thwarting future local employment and revenue prospects. In addition, we believe that this would also increase the risk of existing businesses pulling out of the industrial park, thus damaging existing employment and revenues for the Newport area. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3692.K1 | Lawrence, Tracey | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports the proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way |
| 3 | 3 | Representation As per previous correspondence with NCC I request that the proposed Traveller Transit Site at Celtic way is deleted from the LDP on the grounds that the area should remain a Prestigious Business and Science Park, This area brings much needed employment and boosts the economy. New business has already been deterred from investment in the area (BBC News) and existing business have expressed their concerns of future investment or even relocating away from the area. This is a gateway to Wales for business and the land does not even belong to NCC. Edwina Hart supports the deletion. |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3697.K1 | Mace, Mr B | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Celtic Way and suggest use of Former Ringland Allotments as an alternative.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Celtic Way

3 3 Representation

In my Consultation Form I recommended the Alternative Site of: Former Ringland Allotments, but I see that you have failed to enter this Site under your Alternative Sites Register. Why? You didn't give this site a reference number, but you will find it in your Revised Deposit Plan June 2013 as your Contingency Site on Page 75, item number 5.31.

My representation is that this [the Former Ringland Allotments] site should take the place of your proposed Travellers Transit Site at Celtic Way, Coedkernew, which [latter written] site is absurd and impractical in the extreme, in its total and complete unacceptability and workability as a proposal by all parties except you.

I challenge you to become real, and to scrap the Celtic Way site, in favour of the Former Ringlands Allotments site.

The other material which I submitted is referred to above and your ref is: 222789

I do not want to speak at a hearing session. I'm happy for my comments to be considered by the inspector.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3731.K1 | James, Mr Christopher | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised deposit plan: My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3811.K2 | Middleton, Dr Carolyn | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Celtic Way

3 3 Representation

I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan.
My reasons are:

1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it.
2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area.
3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport.
4. The celtic way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation.

4 4 Additional Material

Yes

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

3849.K17 Suller, Cllr Tom

18/10/2013

E

S

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports the deletion of Celtic Way as a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)027

Although the provision of a transit site would solve the problem of illegal encampments in the area this site should be deleted from the plan as it has the potential to have a harmful effect on the established and future business use in the area.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3861.K1 | Cassidian Limited | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes | No |
|------|----------|--|-----|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Cassidian Limited agrees with the proposal to delete the Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Site from the Revised LDP for the reasons set out in the attached letter dated 25 July 2013, submitted in response to the LDP Consultation. | | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material Cassidian Limited objects to the proposed location of the Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation Site ("Site") at Celtic Way, Coedkernew for the following reasons: 1. This would be sacrificing valuable space in what has been set out as a "Key Employment Area" on the Key Diagram of the Local Development Plan. The area undoubtedly is "prestigious land which has good access to transport links". Celtic Way and its immediate surroundings are used almost exclusively for commercial and industrial purposes, proving the area to be one of the most compelling parts of Newport for companies to establish businesses. 2. In light of Newport's current unemployment situation (especially taking into account the high rate of unemployment in the area's 18-24 age group), the protection of the City's potentially high employment areas, is undoubtedly at the top of the Council's agenda. Accordingly, Cassidian objects to any decision the Council takes to change land use in an already proven industrial development area for what is, in essence, a residential proposal, outside a defined settlement boundary. 3. The Site, if located at Coedkernew, would also restrict expansion opportunities for existing local businesses and those located further afield. When Cassidian moved to its premises at Coedkernew, it was on the assumption that it would become part of a 'bigger business' community and 'mixed use' detracts from the further development of a business heartland. 4. Many businesses relocated to the area with the benefit of grants, which were provided as part of a business strategy to re-energise the area for businesses. The proposed Site (as would any settlement) detracts from this. 5. It is Cassidian's view that it would be in the best interests of those residents of Newport seeking employment, if the Council was to explore alternative locations for the proposed Site. The contingency site at the former Ringland Allotments, as set out in the Local Development Plan, has the advantage over Celtic Way. It complies with the Council's policies regarding social inclusion and the availability of community facilities for new development (as set out in the Local Development Plan's vision for a "Fairer City"). Celtic Way's industrial nature means that it will not provide any sort of community facility that is not purely based on the professional function of the location. It is not agreed that the Site is 'well related to suitable facilities and services for a settlement' . Accordingly, we urge the Council to reconsider the Gypsy and Traveller Transit Site's location to a more suitable alternative site, owing both to the nature of the Celtic Way area and the proposed use. | Yes | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No | |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3867.K1 | Jacobs, Mr Duncan | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised deposit plan:
My reasons are:

1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it.
2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area.
3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport.
4. The celtic way site not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation.

| | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3902.K1 | Young, Ms Amanda | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports the deletion of Celtic Way as a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 3 | 3 | Representation |
|---|---|----------------|

I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|---|---|---|----|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3932.K2 | Middleton, Mr Stephen | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3933.K2 | Middleton, Mr Richard | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports the proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3934.K2 | Middleton, Mr Gareth | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Support the proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3993.K15 | Feeney, Mrs A | | | 10/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Support the deletion of the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Celtic Way

3 3 Representation
Many thanks for this information.

I agree with the proposals for removals/amendments but no doubt these will extend.

Many of the suggestions for sites are in my opinion totally impractical for a host of reasons which will, no doubt be voiced to you by the respective communities.

I have made my opinion very clear regarding my areas's involvement and await the final decision for it's removal as a potential site.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4015.K1 | Nelmes, Mr Nicholas | | | 23/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |
|---------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Support deletion of Gypsy site at Celtic Way.

Item Question Representation Text

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Land at Celtic Way, Marshfield

3 3 Representation
I represent my self as a home owner in celtic horizons adjasent to the site celticway Marshfield. And I am against the building of a gypsy site on that site, no..no.no.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4031.K1 | Edwards, Mr Robert | | | 01/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Objection - land is needed for business purposes

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number Celtic Horizons | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Not provided | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation To get this city back to a viable, thriving community we need this land for business development - not itinerate people who will have an adverse effect on the surrounding areas for expansion and new development. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4046.K2 | Jensen, Mr George | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4047.K2 | Jensen, Mrs Iris | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4057.K1 | Wilton-Jones, Mr Peter | | | 10/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Answer |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request that the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are as follows: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with even Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have already pulled out of locating into Celtic Way due to the site being considered, NCC cannot afford to deter any more business from this area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating from Newport if this location is chosen. 4. The Celtic Way site is not safe due to its location near open water, railways and an electricity substation that those who are not permanent residence would not appreciate the dangers of. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4062.K1 | Fereday, Lesley | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised deposit plan: My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4064.K1 | Barry, Ms Amy | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised deposit plan: My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4067.K1 | Whitcombe, Mr Joseph | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of the site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|--|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised deposit plan: My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4073.K2 | Davies, R | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4074.K2 | Davies, Ms Marie | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4077.K1 | Evans, Mrs Christine | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised deposit plan: My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4078.K1 | Chanter, Mr Gerald | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised deposit plan: My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4079.K1 | Lloyd, Claire | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of the site from revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|--|-----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)027 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Celtic Way | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised deposit plan: My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The celtic way site not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4081.K1 | Morgan, Annette | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of the site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Celtic Way

3 3 Representation

I request that Celtic Way be deleted from the NCC revised deposit plan. My reasons are. 1 Celtic Way is a flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy/traveller site location, with Edwina Hart WG Economy Minister officially objecting to it. 2 F our major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area. 3 Quinns radiators may consider relocating away from Newport. 4 The Celtic Way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity sub station.

4 4 Additional Material Yes

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4124.K1 | Lawrence, Shirley | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | S | | M | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Support the proposed deletion of Celtic Way Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

As per previous correspondence with NCC I request that the proposed Traveller Transit Site at Celtic way is deleted from the LDP on the grounds that the area should remain a Prestigious Business and Science Park, This area brings much needed employment and boosts the economy.

New business has already been deterred from investment in the area (BBC News) and existing business have expressed their concerns of future investment or even relocating away from the area.

This is a gateway to Wales for business and the land does not even belong to NCC.

Edwina Hart supports the deletion.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4125.K1 | Sharma, Dan | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Support the deletion of the Celtic Way Gypsy and Traveller site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)027

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Celtic Way

3 3 Representation
I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the NCC revised Deposit Plan.

My reasons are:

1. Celtic Way is a 'flagship business park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy/Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, WG Economy Minister, officially objecting to it.
2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way, NCC cannot afford to deter any more businesses from the area.
3. Quinn Radiator's may consider relocating away from Newport.
4. The Celtic Way site is not safe due to its location near open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4231.K1 | Pittard, Lorraine | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 575/ Celtic Way

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Celtic Way

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
I request the Celtic Way site be deleted from the N.C.C. Revised Deposit Plan. My reasons are: 1. Celtic Way is a 'Flagship Business Park' and therefore not suitable as a Gypsy / Traveller site location with Edwina Hart, W.G. Economy Minister, officially objecting to it. 2. Four major companies have pulled out of locating into the Celtic Way. N.C.C. cannot afford to deter any more business from the area. 3. Quinn Radiators may consider relocating away from Newport. 4. The Celtic Way site is not safe due to its location near to open water, main roads, railways and an electricity substation.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 577/ Penmaen Wharf,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3214.K1 | Collingbourne Properties | Hannaby Planning Solutions | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 577/ Penmaen Wharf

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of Penmaen Wharf from Revised LDP

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

This submission is made on behalf of Collingbourne Properties, in response to the consultation on the Alternative Sites Register Consultation dated September 2013. The Penmaen Wharf site (Site Reference RAS(D)011) is included in the Alternative Sites Register as a result of representations made by Natural Resources Wales to delete the site as a housing allocation.

The points made by NRW are summarised as follows:

The allocation fails to meet the Test of Soundness CE2 because the proposed allocation for housing are located partially or wholly within Zone C (sub division C1 and C2), as defined by the Development Advice Map (DAM) referred to in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN15) (July 2004).

Allocations must not be allocated solely on the basis of an extant planning permission and such sites must be tested (against up to date environmental criteria and information; including flood consequence assessment) to confirm whether the land is suitable for allocation.

Either;

- i) Further consideration and/or work is carried out to justify the site allocations with sufficient assessment to demonstrate that risks and consequences can be acceptably managed in line with section 10 of TAN15, or;
- ii) The allocation be deleted from the Plan or boundary amended to exclude all land identified as being at risk from flooding.

The proposed deletion of the existing housing commitment site is in response to representation Rep No: 3683.L78//H01.16 by the Natural Resources Wales which opposes showing the housing commitment on the LDP proposals map. The reason for this is that the proposed site allocation for housing is located 'partially or wholly within Zone C' and the NRW view is that allocations must not be solely on the basis of an extant planning permission and such sites must be tested to confirm whether the land is suitable because there may have been a material change in information since planning permission was granted. However, this representation is a scatter gun approach and bundles all the sites listed in H1 together. It does not state that new information does show that there is a problem with this site but that it might.

The comments continue to demonstrate a misunderstanding of the Local Plan system. Policy H1 identifies the main sources of housing land for the plan period and as part of that the first part of policy H1 lists sites which have planning permission or where development has already commenced. This is not an 'allocation' as such but is a recognition that the development can be carried out without any further control or consent. In the case of Penmaen Wharf planning permission was granted on 17th May 2011.

During the course of the application the then Environment Authority Wales commented as follows:

The site lies partially within zones C2, C1 and B as defined by the development advice map referred to under TAN15 (Development and Flood Risk – July 2004). The TAN states that a highly vulnerable development such as this should not be permitted within zone C2 (Note: The area of C2 is only around the edge of the wharf and not where the residential development is proposed). Notwithstanding this, the EA are satisfied that the flood consequences assessment (FCA) submitted demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed and so recommend a condition to ensure minimum slab and site levels in the event that planning permission is granted contrary to TAN15. The site levels vary from 8.0m to 9.2m above ordnance datum (AOD) and the proposals involve raising the site. As the flooding would be tidal, the floor slabs of the dwellings should be above the 1:1000 year flood tidal level of 9.10m AOD with the roads and parking areas being above the 1:200 year tidal prediction of 8.87m AOD both allowing for climate change over the next 50 years. In relation to contamination, conditions are recommended to require investigation and any necessary remediation works. Construction waste is required to be disposed of satisfactorily. An appropriate Assessment is required to be carried out to assess the impacts on the River Usk SAC. The site contains Japanese Knotweed which needs to be prevented from spreading. The EA support the recommendations of the Ecological Appraisal Report submitted.

These comments by the EAW confirmed that the 'area of C2 is only around the edge of the wharf and not where the residential development is proposed' and that development is acceptable on this site. Planning permission was therefore granted in accordance with the EAW advice.

If development is not started within 5 years from the date of the permission (before 17 May 2016) then a new permission will be required. At that point, irrespective of the 'allocation' in H1, if it is shown that new standards or environmental changes have occurred in the meantime then a new permission may not be forthcoming.

Likewise, even if the site is deleted from H1 it will not alter the fact that the site has an extant planning permission. As such it is inappropriate to carry out any additional works to assess the site and it is inappropriate and pointless to delete it from H1.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|---|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| <p>The LPA are required to show in the Development Plan how they will meet the need for new housing during the plan period and part of the required housing supply is met by sites such as Penmaen Wharf that have planning permission.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | Yes | |
| <p>Please note that these objections include a request to speak at the Inquiry as the various representations submitted in respect of the site also include a request to present their case to the Inspector in person.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

Site,RepnType: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3844.K1 | Hando, Mr David | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | I | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Hartridge Farm Road

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I write to support representations made by the Newport Traveller Sites Study Group and Ringland Matters representing 10,000 petitions and the Report of the Musker Sumner Partnership commissioned by Ringland Matters. In particular the deletion of RAS(N)027 Hartridge Farm Road and RAS(N)026 Ringland Allotments and consideration of the alternative sites suggested in particular the former Speedway Site and the strategy proposed by the Newport Traveller Site Study Group.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|--|---|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | | Yes | | | | | | | |
| <p>My starting point is that I am fully in favour of legal, properly run, Council Traveller sites. During my eight years on Newport City Council I consistently argued, with virtually no support, that legal sites were the only way of solving the problems of illegal ones. However, legal sites must be in the right location.</p> <p>Residential in the Hartridge and Ringland areas have outlines a large number of reasons why the Hartridge Farm Road and Allotment sites are manifestly unsuitable. I will restrict myself to just five reasons why the Hartridge Farm Road site is flawed, rendering the Local Development Plan unsound.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That site has long been identified for housing in the Unitary Development Plan. Council committed itself to spending £29m on replacing Hartridge High School, largely by borrowing to be repaid by land sales. Relinquishing that site leaves a £6m gap in Council finances. More, in fact, as the smaller but more prestigious Pwl Pen site would be blighted by the proximity of a traveller site. Therefore, the proposal undermines the Council's financial strategy and renders the LDP unsound. 2. The proposal also undermines the Council's educational strategy for the east of the city. For years school numbers have been unbalanced because of the reluctance of parents to send their children to Hartridge High Scholl because it was out of date and dilapidated, affecting the morale of both pupils and staff. As a consequence Caerleon and St Julian's High Schools have been seriously overcrowded, affecting the quality of what they can offer. If parents were told those schools were full some exercised their right to apply to Caldicot or even Chepstow while others opted for private schools. To rectify this situation the Council decide to invest £29m, largely borrowed, to build a new school and develop a new image in the form of Llanwern High School. The transformation is remarkable. A brand new state of the art school that pupils (and staff!) want to go to without all the disadvantages of the crumbling, spread out old buildings. Morale has soared with attendance, appearance, results, and, vitally, enrolment all on the up. All this will be imperilled by the proximity of a traveller site and the £29m new building could become a very expensive white elephant, while the damaging pressure on Caerleon and St Julian's High Schools will resume. There will be a similarly detrimental affect on Ysgol Gymraeg Casnewydd should a traveller site be just the width of a road away. 3. The RSPCA animal shelter could not continue its highly valued work with a traveller site next door. The shelters' dogs and those of the travellers would set each other off and neither the animals, the residents not the travellers would have any peace. Likewise, the RSPCA would not allow its staff and volunteer dog walkers to take nervous and damaged dogs past the travellers' site. The shelter would have to move but there is no provision in the LDP for this. The same might be true if houses were built on the site, although current residents have no problem, but funding for resettlement could be allowed for by planning condition. 4. The same is true of the Road Safety Centre which does vital work with youngsters who could be a menace on the roads. Road Safety lessons are a vital part of the curriculum of difficult to educate pupils at the High School. They can walk to the Centre and bussing them elsewhere would put a continuing drain on scarce school resources. No provision for re-location is made in the LDP. 5. The policy of concentration of traveller families is flawed. Lumping three separate families of difficult traditions together would create a large concentration against WG guidelines and common sense. Travellers have talked about a "concentration camp" and a "ghetto". A leading councillor who was involved in devising this policy spoke in Council of putting them all together for ease of control and preventing the pain spreading to other areas. I would suggest that smaller units spread across the community makes far more sense. <p>For these five reasons and many more put forward by others, such as transforming the lives of the immediately adjacent neighbours, traffic congestion, SDR and railway noise and danger, I maintain that the LDP is unsound. I would particularly stress the undermining of the Council's own financial and educational strategies.</p> <p>If objectors are expected to put forward alternative sites I would suggest returning to the carefully considered original sites which were recommended by both planners and councillors. There will be objections to all sites and none are prefect. However, difficulties such as flood plain considerations can be overcome. A site that wasn't available when the original five were proposed was the former speedway site. That is probably the best option of all and has the important advantage that the travellers favour it. Despite what has been represented that is emphatically not the case with Hartridge Farm Road and the Allotments. Consultation with the travellers was seriously flawed.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | Yes | | | | | | | |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3890.K1 | French, T J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Hartridge Farm Road

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I express many and varied points of view in my first response but omitted a very important one, one that the council as a whole, council officers all –grade- and councillors should be as concerned as I over. Which is one of Racial Harmony.

It is a matter of record that when an illegal camp was set up on the Hartridge Farm Road site some seven to ten years ago the travellers made representations to the then Head of Hartridge High requesting he instruct those students responsible to cease from stoning the caravans on the site. The police were also involved but were refused access onto the site – it is not known why. This is the reason the G/Ts have expressed their concerns and stated at a public meeting their reluctance to accept the site. A view that I support, hence my desire to persuade the local authority to see sense and make the only logical decision that can be made, that is to accommodate the G/Ts as far from any built up largely populated settled community as possible.

I am sure that you will be aware that there is a "Ten Minute" bill currently before parliament that when passed will remove the obligation on local authorities to provide sites. Using "Parliamentary Privilege" the mover expressed concern as to how some of these G/Ts make money. I do not subscribe to or support his point of view but if it were only in part true it would cause some friction between the local settled community and the G/Ts. That said, as mentioned above some of the less responsible elements of settled communities do not need a reason to cause trouble and it was also stated at the same meeting G/Ts would not want trouble but if it came they would handle it. Should this type of problem ever occur the likelihood of escalation would be real if two large communities one a settled housing estate and a G/Ts camp are in such close proximity. It is perhaps worthwhile remembering the case in Leighton Buzzard England involving slavery and servitude on a large travellers caravan site. You I pray would not that happening here in The City of Newport. I am aware that many G/Ts are decent, peaceful people who would also become caught up disputes caused by whom ever.

I so not want my family caught up in or between any such problems and hope our leaders have the wisdom to rule logically and justly on this for the benefits of all residents, including the Settled and G/Ts. It is with these vary real concerns in mind that I support the utilization of one or some of the alternative sites here listed below.

I expressed my objection to the Revised Local Development plan, as it is, during the first six week period and sincerely hope the plan will be changed if not by the current Labour controlled council then by the inspector when he reviews all the objections, representations and comments together with the reason here given for re-evaluating and using any of the alternative site, including some that were not properly assessed or not assessed at all.

3938.K2 Newport Traveller Sites Study Group

24/10/2013

P

M

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Support deletion of site

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)025 Land at Hartridge Farm Road. Briefly, using that site would undermine both the financial and educational strategies of the Council. It was intended that the land should be sold for housing to partly offset the £29m cost of Llanwern High School, most of which had to be borrowed. The investment was made to transform the attractiveness of Llanwern High as opposed to the old, crumbling and unpopular Hartridge High School. The aim was to balance secondary education in the east of the city by taking pressure off the oversubscribed St Julian's and Caerleon schools. Likewise, the potentially valuable Pwll Pen site would become unattractive to developers and purchasers. A travellers site would have a detrimental affect on both Llanwern High and Ysgol Gymraeg Casnewydd, which is just a road width away. There would be a similarly detrimental affect on the residents of Hartridge Farm Road, the much used and highly respected RSPCA Animal Shelter and the valuable Road Safety Centre.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3963.K1 | Rudland, Mr Hazel | | | 30/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Objects to proposed use of Hartridge Farm Road as G&T site

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|---|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)017 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Hartridge Farm Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I am a member of Llanwern golf club, where we have worked hard to provide a local community asset. If the Gypsy encampment is sited at the proposed site, we will have ponys being ridden across it. This has happened before when the Gypsys were encamped nearby. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material The golf club has submitted many reasons why it would be a bad idea. | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3982.K16 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Support for deletion of land as allocation for G&T site

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(D)

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Land at Hartridge Farm Road

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 MSP are instructed by the Ringland Matters Group ('the Group) to report on the Revised Deposit Newport Local Development Plan, (the 'revised LDP') issued for consultation and comment to interested parties . The group has been set up to look at the proposed 'allocation' in the deposit LDP of the residential and transit gypsy and traveller sites at Hartridge Farm Road and the Ringland allotments. This report therefore looks at and assesses the gypsy and traveller aspects of the deposit LDP.

1.2. This report is made to the group and we acknowledge that it can be submitted to Newport City Council by the group as a duly made representation to the revised LDP.

1.3. In line with the requirements of the Local Development Plan Wales (LDPW) and its accompanying regulations 2005, this report sets out to apply the test of 'soundness'. These tests are set out in terms of 'procedural'; 'consistency' and 'coherence and effectiveness'. In this assessment, the key tests of consistency and coherence and effectiveness have been looked at. We have not paid regard to procedural matters as they relate to compliance with the Delivery Agreement, the Community Involvement Scheme and Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment, which are matters for the Government to address.

1.4. However, one procedural matter that does arise is the issue concerning the issue of the revised LDP itself. This revision follows the placing on deposit of the LDP in its original form in 2012. In relation to the groups' interest, that original deposit plan had gypsy and traveller site allocations on land well away from them and so had no effect to them at all. The revised LDP is said to be made by the Officers of the Council under regulation 17 of the 2005 LDP Regulations.

1.5. We have looked accordingly at part 17 of those regulations, which deal with how to make a deposit plan. We can find no provision in them for a revised LDP once it has been placed on deposit. Rather, any changes should be dealt with by way of 'focused changes' to the plan, whereby the appointed Inspector can only make changes to the plan, and these are by way of directions the Council must then follow. The Council has agreement from the Welsh Assembly that a revised LDP may be 'the best way forward', 1 but under the regulations there is no provision for such a revision to be made. Therefore the original deposit LOP should have gone forward to examination with its original gypsy site allocations. The group therefore believe that the revised deposit LDP has been 'concocted' by the newly elected Council and rushed through to avoid those newly elected members having a 'gypsy' site in their own wards. Thus the revision is a political one, not one based on the regulatory requirements. The group find therefore the revised 'process', particularly in relation to the gypsy and traveller site allocations to have been carried out 'in a rush' with incumbent shortfalls, which this report will highlight. We find this 'rush' unsurprising, given that Newport's LDP production is far behind the originally intended four years from 2005, as set out in the 2005 regulations and is now one of the last to be produced in Wales.

2.0. THE TESTS OF SOUNDNESS

2.1. The Planning Acts require all LDP's to be subject to an examination by an independent Inspector. That appointed Inspector will assess the soundness of the plan. That test of soundness relates to the policy content of the plan and the process for its production.

Under these headings, there are '10' tests identified against which the test of soundness will be applied. We have identified five of those 10 tests which are applicable to the concerns of the group. These are:

- test C1 - regard to other development plans; policies and strategies of adjoining areas;
- test C2 - regard to national policy
- test CE1 - coherent strategy and compatibility with neighbouring authorities;
- test CE2 - realistic having regard to alternatives and a robust evidence base and;
- test CE3 - evidence of implementation and monitoring

These tests we now go on to accordingly apply.

3.0. TEST C1

3.1. Section 225 of the Housing Act 2004 requires local authorities to assess the needs of gypsy and traveller accommodation. Guidance on how that 13 to be assessed sets out that it may be beneficial to 'work in partnership at sub regional or regional level' 3 and 'early discussions should take place with other authorities in the region to identify the scope for partnership working' 4.

3.2. Circular 30/2007 states that, following the guidance for Local Market Housing Assessments, the circular guidance 'strongly recommends that local authorities work in partnership with neighbouring authorities as travelling patterns are liable to cross local authority boundaries' 5.

3.3. Despite the above national guidance, the Council's gypsy and traveller strategy in the revised LDP is based, almost solely, on the findings of the Fordham report, published in 2010. Having looked at that report, we can find no recommendation or assessment of any cross boundary working with adjacent authorities. This may be because this aspect was not included in the Council's brief to Fordham. In any event that needs' report can only be used to inform the Council's policy, it is not the policy itself. However, the revised LDP policy appears to be based solely on it, thereby completely ignoring the policy advice of Government and thereby, in our view, failing to meet test C1 of the LDP regulations.

3.4. The Government's overall approach to gypsy and traveller provision has been assessed numerically, and this is estimated to be between 275 - 305 families to meet need and family increase to 2016 . Whilst these figures can be further revised as a result of each local authority carrying out its own needs assessment, there is no paper, policy or report in the revised LDP which shows how provision in adjoining authorities or across the region or sub region has been taken into account, affects or otherwise the projected needs base for Newport or its gypsy -traveller provision . For example, in relation to the provision of transit sites, Circular 30/2007 makes it clear that such provision is an across boundary issue. We are aware, for example, that Cardiff is actively seeking a major transit site along the M4 corridor and yet in the revised LDP no account is taken as to whether or not such provision will meet the transit needs of Newport from such a site, which will be only a few miles away and

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

on the major transport links through the region, therefore meeting transit needs. Without any such assessment, transit provision in this revised LDP is fundamentally flawed as it ignores the Government's approach to such provision. On permanent sites, the same applies. That is that the numbers required to be provided may (or may not) be affected by provision in adjoining or nearby authorities. No assessment is made, so the revised LDP assumptions on numbers required to be provided in the Newport area cannot be relied on as 'need' in the area, because there is no apparent basis to assess that need in the region. There is no assessment as to how the numbers of permanent pitches proposed for Newport in the revised LDP affect or otherwise the overall provision in the region, or Wales as a whole. It cannot therefore be known whether the overall targets identified by the Government's own assessment is met or whether an overprovision is made and whether that overprovision will result in immigration from other areas if such overprovision is made, to the detriment of Newport residents. We say there is a detriment because it is acknowledged that a gypsy or traveller site adjacent to existing housing will result in community disharmony".

4.0. TEST C2

4.1. The most obvious conflict with national policy in relation to gypsy and traveller sites in the revised LDP is the size of the permanent site proposed at Hartridge Farm Road. 43 pitches are proposed at the site, which could be the equivalent of 172 individual caravans (assuming 4 caravans per pitch). National guidance on site design of such sites set out quite clearly that they should ideally be no more than 12 pitches and taking into account local circumstances and need, no more than 15-20 pitches". The proposal at Hartridge Farm Road is over twice that recommended size, completely in conflict with that national guidance and therefore a failure of test C2.

4.2. We have had a look at the selection criterion used by the Council for site selection of gypsy and traveller sites. The actual criteria used by the Scurtiny Review Assessment in 2012, relate to various points but none relate to site size". This is despite the fact that in that same paper, it is outlined that consultation by the Council with the gypsy and traveller community in 2010, revealed that a 'small site' was desirable (it is in fact placed at the top of the list10). This however appears to have been ignored. We can find no paper or report either in the LDP or its documents that sets out why a site 3.5 times the size (43/12) of that recommended in Government guidance is proposed. This the Council is required to do if this part of the test C2 is to be met.

4.3. National policy requires that the gypsy and traveller community be involved at an early stage in the preparation of LDP's. The Council's Gypsy and Traveller accommodation background paper states that since 2010, the Council has dramatically increased its interaction with that community. However, we can find no papers to the revised LDP that set out what those consultations were, what questions or what options were put to that community. Thus that part of the LDP process is not transparent enough to enable other stakeholders, such as the community around the proposed residential site, to assess how extensive or appropriate that consultation has been or whether the proposed allocation reflects that community's desires and wants. Whilst this should be set out in the Community Involvement Scheme as part of the LDP process, we have still been unable to identify for example, if any of the suggested sites were put forward or proposed by that community. What is clear is that the Council's selection criterion used for the site selection does not have any criteria based on whether the gypsy and traveller community want the sites or not. That runs contrary to Government advice because it is not identified to what extent the sites put forward arise from work with the gypsy and traveller community, whether they are suitable for them or which, if any sites, are put forward by them. This should be made clear and transparent in the LDP and in accordance with Government advice". Further J without such information being readily available and transparent, it cannot be relied upon as fully informing the LDP process and hence, site selection.

4.4. On the matter of site selection, the criterion the Council has used appear to be selectively ignoring Government guidance as to what, and what weight, should be attached to them. The criterion used for site selection in the first and second rounds relate primarily to avoiding environmentally sensitive areas, proximity principles (including settlement boundaries) and whether or not the sites are owned by the Council. 12 Circular 30/2007 sets out that in terms of site selection, sites in, or near, existing settlements should be considered first. However, it also states that rural settings are acceptable in principle. In such areas it states that over rigid application of national or LOP policies that seek a reduction in car borne travel would not be appropriate. It seems to us that the selection criteria used by the Council by applying the settlement boundary/rural exception criterion, discounts automatically this part of possible sites suitable in accordance with that Government guidance. In other words, all rural sites are dismissed. That is not what Government guidance says and so again, the selection process fails test C2 as no such sites have been considered.

4.5. National guidance on site constraint policies also seem to have been ignored on the sites selected in the revised LDP for gypsy and traveller accommodation. The transient site proposed at Llanwern is steeply sloping and has national grid pylons over it. Not only that, but the site sits on the side of one of the main, if not the main, arterial roads into and out of Newport. The site is clearly visible by users of that road. Placing the site here has the potential to undermine the well landscaped visual amenity of the rest of that route, to the detriment of the well being of Newport as a whole.

4.6. The Hartridge Road residential site has the main railway line along its southern border and the main SDR route to the north. This will create noise for that site unsuitable for residential occupation and be a potential hazard. Whilst there are underpasses under the OTR route, these are unpleasant and not used. Local knowledge confirms that they have been used as 'ambush sites' in the past. Planning guidance advises against putting such sites near hazards>.

5.0. TEST CE1

5.1. We have already largely covered the point of compatibility with adjoining authorities in the section on test C1, which is regard to be had to the development plans of adjoining authorities. We can find no report or assessment of any regard to what provision adjoining authorities are making for gypsy and traveller provision or how this may affect provision or otherwise of such sites in Newport. Whilst each authority has to make provision for its own communities it may contain, national guidance makes it clear that gypsy and travellers are a cross boundary issue and therefore any strategy should account for provision or otherwise in adjoining authorities.

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

5.2. It seems to us to be unsurprising that such a cross boundary approach has not been undertaken in the revised LDP. That is because the gypsy and traveller issue has only recently been tackled in the LDP evidence base since 2010 and given the priority of the Council to now issue its LDP (as it is far behind its timetable), the Council has simply taken the short route of applying directly the 'need' identified in the Fordham report and applied it to a single site.

5.3 Given that there is no evidence base showing how Newport's provision fits in with or is affected by adjoining authorities or how the provision for such sites fits in with the Government's projections for gypsy and traveller sites in Wales¹⁵, and there is no evidence of cooperation between Newport and any other authority¹⁶, this test is also failed.

6.0. TEST CE2

6.1. The revised LDP strategy for gypsy and travellers relies, almost solely, on the Fordham needs assessment. The strategy simply takes the findings of that report in terms of numbers and then finds a site big enough to accommodate it. That is not a realistic means of approaching a strategy for gypsy and traveller sites.

6.2. The Fordham report finds that the 'need' in Newport is for 29 additional residential pitches over the next 10 years¹⁷. The revised LDP strategy is to provide for 43 additional residential pitches¹⁸. This difference in numbers of pitches to be provided is only explained in the background paper as 'through this interaction' - that being interaction with the gypsy and traveller community since the production of the Fordham report in 2010. We can find no report or assessment in the LDP which explains how this figure is arrived at or why. The Fordham report arrives at the figure of 29 additional residential pitches as that includes an allowance of 25 pitches to accommodate need as it stands now and a 3% growth factor¹⁹. Even allowing for natural growth beyond 2019, as allowed for in the Fordham report, to 2026, the figure does not come anywhere near the 43 pitches put forward in the revised LDP. Without the evidence base to clearly show how this figure of 43 pitches is arrived at in the LDP, the base for it is not robust and is unrealistic, thereby failing test CE2.

6.3. The methodology for the revised LDP for gypsies and travellers is to place all the residential pitches on one site, namely Hartridge Farm Road. We can find no rationale for why that method of dealing with this issue is adopted in the revised LDP as the methodology for doing so is not explained. Further the policy is to provide all the projected need of 43 pitches at once (the Council say the site will be 'phased' but we do not consider that to be realistic once the site is operational). Again it is not explained in the LDP documents why this should be the case. The Fordham report identifies that 25 additional pitches are needed in Newport over the next ten years²⁰. Of these, the Fordham report recommends that 14 pitches should be provided on social rented pitches (Le. Council or public body owned) over the next five years²¹. The policy for gypsy and traveller provision is not however designed in this way if all the pitches for the whole LDP period (including the extra 14 over and above the Fordham report to make the total of 43 pitches proposed) are to be provided on one site. We cannot see any control mechanism in the revised LDP to achieve phasing. It is more realistic that once the site is operational, it will simply 'fill up' from the start. This is especially so as such a large site will attract 'overspill' from adjacent authorities and we have already pointed out that that issue has not been addressed in the revised LDP.

6.4. It seems to us therefore that the revised LDP strategy for gypsy and traveller provision is not realistic in that it is not formulated to reflect the findings of the needs assessment. When looking at approaches in other areas, for example Pembrokeshire, the LDP, (which has been accepted as sound by an Inspector), their approach is to make some initial provision and then by review periodically, to have further sites if found to be needed. Thus the site provision is spread out on smaller sites over a longer period if shown to be needed by review. We are not aware that this revised LDP has considered, or it is not shown in the LDP documents, any alternative strategy for site provision over the plan period. This it could have done if the Fordham report had been interpreted differently. Thus the revised LDP is not realistic having regard to alternatives and thus the strategy adopted is not based on a robust evidence base. Test CE2 is also therefore failed.

6.5. The identified problem in the revised LDP strategy of providing the gypsy and traveller site 'en masse' in those numbers at the Hartridge Farm Road site is that it will overwhelm the existing residential population there, which is small scale and rural in the lanes behind Llanwrn High School. A traveller/gypsy site of this size, which will also have to provide on site employment facilities, storage, livestock provision, will completely change the character of that area for those residents, not to mention for the two adjacent schools. That is not a sound basis on which to formulate the strategy for traveller/gypsy provision, which as guidance suggests, ought to be formulated to allow better integration and inclusion with existing local communities.

7.0. TEST CE3

7.1. The LDP is required to show evidence of how the suggested sites are to be implemented and how they are to be monitored. The reason for the monitoring is so that the LDP can be adjusted to suit new or changing circumstances.

7.2. With regard to implementation of the Hartridge Farm Road site and the Ringland allotment site at Llanwrn, obvious problems are evident for which we cannot find any evidence in the LDP as to how they are to be addressed. First, with regard to the transit/residential site at Llanwrn, this is an allotment site. There is specific legislation covering allotments. They are the Small Holdings and Allotment Act 1908 and The Allotments Act 1925. In brief, these set out that land purchased by local authorities as allotments must not be disposed of without Ministerial Consent²². We can find no evidence in the LDP of such consent being obtained. That consent requires provision to be made for allotment holders displaced. We can see nowhere in the LDP that allows for this. Further, local authorities must assess the demand for allotments in the area and if there is, there is a statutory duty to provide them. Further still, allotments form part of the amenity provision of open and recreational

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

space in an area. We can find no calculation as to whether the loss of the allotments to a transit/residential site use would lead to a shortfall of such provision in the area.

7.3. Second, as regards the residential site at Hartridge Farm Road, there are existing uses on that land which are the RSPCA and the Road Safety Centre. We understand these are on a long term lease from the Council. Lease provisions are set out in terms that they have to be renewed, unless the occupier chooses not to do so. We cannot find any reference in the LDP as to two these uses will be dealt with. Should they remain in situ, there will be conflict of use between them and the proposed residential gypsy/traveller site, particularly the RSPCA centre in terms of noise from animals, particularly dogs, much to the detriment of neighbours around the site.

7.4. The Welsh Assembly Government requires a biannual caravan count to be done in each local authority area²⁴. The revised LDP policy with regard to gypsy and traveller sites proposes a 'once and for all' solution by placing all perceived 'need' on one residential site. This 'up front' loading of the policy does not allow for any variation in need that may occur over the plan period and this will be known as a result of the required caravan counts. This not only inflexible, but also no policies are allowed for in the revised LDP for possible adjustments, up or down, to numbers needed. The policy approach should, in our view, be aimed at providing the immediate 14 pitches on Council or public body owned land with the other 15 pitches provided on smaller private sites, as the Fordham report suggests. The additional pitches taking the number up to 43 should not be included at this stage, but a flexible policy introduced into the LDP to take account of the biannual counts. In this way, the swamping of an existing community by such a large residential site could be both avoided initially and dealt with as part of the review process of the LDP. This would allow for monitoring to take place. As the revised LDP policies do not so this, in our view, test CE3 is failed as there is no provision for monitoring in the revised LDP with regard to gypsy and traveller provision.

8.0. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

8.1. In our review of the revised LDP with regard to gypsy and traveller provision, we have found a number of shortfalls as regards to the test of 'soundness' to be applied. As an overview, we are not surprised as looking at the overall process, it appears to us that the gypsy and traveller policy has attempted to be revised as part of the LDP process in a very tight timescale. This is not helped by the single residential site chosen to accommodate the perceived need, which will result in one of the largest residential gypsy/traveller sites in Europe. This will totally swamp the existing local Hartridge community and such provision flies in the face of national policy for such sites with regard to size. Neither is the revised LDP further helped by the apparent dismissal in the site selection criterion of existing or unauthorised encampments or any site outside the urban boundary. That is not what Government guidance on this issue sets out. Further, we can see no evidence in the revised LDP of any cross boundary liaison or any assessment as to how the policy put forward fits in with adjacent strategies or the regional picture of the provision for residential and, in particular, transit sites. Without that being done, we fail to see how the revised LDP can be judged to be sound as the evidence base used is not robust and cannot be relied on.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | Yes |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | Yes |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|

All 15 sites listed ass attached

Highly emotive

The large number of residents represented by the group

The large number of residents supporting the group

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3990.K1 | Donachie, Ms Chloe | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Object to Gypsy and Traveller Site at Hartridge Farm Road

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)017 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Hartridge Farm Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I do not believe that putting a travellers site next to two schools is advisable, one of which my son attends, (ysgol Gymraeg Caesnewydd). There are a lot is negative views/thoughts about travellers and the trouble they cause, The Welsh language needs all the help it can get to thrive and I fear that putting the site so close to the school will put parents off the idea of sending their children to the school. After all our childrens education should be prioritised! | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3999.K1 | Harvey, Cllr Debbie | | | 12/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Support the removal of the Hartridge Farm Road Gypsy & Traveller allocation.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)025

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Hartridge Farm Road

3 3 Representation

A we are now in a 6 week consultation regarding the Alternative Sites Register for the LDP and the Gypsy and Traveller sites, we are writing to you to support the case for the removal of the Hartridge and Ringland sites.

We do not feel that the two sites were the right choice from the outset given that the financial loss on the land on the land would be approx. £5M and the current climate as it is that figure is simply too high a price to sustain. In addition there are the other implications on the wildlife.

So in short we support the proposal to delete Hartridge Gypsy & Traveller sites from the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4000.K2 | Green, Mr & Mrs M | | | 13/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Support the deletion of the Hartridge Farm Road

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)025

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Hartridge Farm Road

3 3 Representation

My Councillor has informed me that we are now in a 6 week consultaion regarding the Alternative Sites Register for the LDP and Gypsy and Traveller sites, we are writing to you to support the case for the removal of the Hartridge and Ringland sites.

We do not think that the two sites were the right choice as that land would have serious implications on the road leading to the schools and also on the SDR. There is so much traffic on the school days leading to and from the schools onto the SDR and we feel that any further traffic burden placed on that area will be detrimental.

So in conclusion we support the proposal to delete Hartridge Gypsy and Traveller sites from the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4012.K2 | Redmond, Mr Andrew | | | 22/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Support the Deletion of Gypsy and Traveller site at Power Close (Hartridge Farm Road)

| Item Question | Representation Text | |
|---------------|---------------------|--|
|---------------|---------------------|--|

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|
| 2 2 | Alternative Site Name Power Close | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|

| | | |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 3 3 | Representation | |
|-----|----------------|--|

Choosing one of the three above sites will damage the work done to improve the perception of the Ringland and Alway areas of Newport. A lot of time, effort and money have been invested in what has traditionally been seen as a 'rough' part of the city, and this will undo all of the good work done. People have invested their hard-earned money into the 'Broadheath' redevelopment and this will damage any trust in Newport City Council, especially as locating the travellers at any of the above sites will then affect the local housing prices. I also hope that a community known for its lack of contributions to the social funds (i.e. Tax, National Insurance etc.) are contributing to the cost of the works involved in creating such a site, and also be responsible for maintaining the facility to an agreed standard. I have no objection to their way of life, or their freedom to choose that way of life, but I do object to paying for it with my tax contributions. They should be either wholly responsible for the construction of such sites, or be made to contribute to the local community by paying rent and council tax whilst they are resident within the boundaries of the city.

| | | |
|-----|---------------------|----|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | No |
|-----|---------------------|----|

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|-----|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4018.K1 | Hutchinson, J | | | 25/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Support the deletion of gypsy and traveller site at Hartridge farm road

| Item Question | Representation Text | |
|---------------|---------------------|--|
|---------------|---------------------|--|

| | | |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 3 3 | Representation | |
|-----|----------------|--|

I do not want to live next to the largeset gypsie site in Europe, 172 plots for just 3 familites, gypsies live by there own rules and not by the law. Even the police if they have to enter a gypsie site go in force, why?. People that live in ringland do not want gypsie site when are the council going to listen.

| | | |
|-----|---------------------|----|
| 4 4 | Additional Material | No |
|-----|---------------------|----|

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 5 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |
|-----|---|----|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4025.K1 | Langham, C | | | 30/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Supports deletion of allocation for G&T site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)017 Hartridge Farm Road

(NB The contact states RAS(N)017 on the form, though it is believed that the objection refers to RAS(D)025)

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Hartridge Farm Road

3 3 Representation

Member of golf club adjacent to proposed site. We already have children causing chaos on the course. Should this PP be granted, we would have gypsies riding their ponies over the course.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

4027.K1 Ford, Mr Michael

30/09/2013

P

S

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Supports deletion of site for G&T use

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(N)017

(NB contact stated RAS(N)017 on form, but the representation seems to refer to RAS(D)025)

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Hartridge Farm Road

3 3 Representation

The close proximity of two schools plus businesses (present and proposed) makes this site totally unsuitable for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4049.K1 | Bundy, Sonya | | | 08/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Supports the proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Representation Text</i> | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(N)025 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Hartridge Farm Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I oppose for gypsy travellers to use this site for the safety of my children using the school next to the site also near where I live | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4058.K1 | Robinson, Victoria | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|---|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)025 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Hartridge Farm Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I wish the Hartridge farm Road site to be removed from the LDP because:- - Too close to the RSPCA - noise issues - Too close to the new high school - Size of site outside of WG guidance on good practise - Location regarded by travellers as being unsuitable - Access is difficult | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4059.K1 | Robinson, Mr David | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|---|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)025 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Hartridge Farm Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation I wish the Hartridge farm Road site to be removed from the LDP because:- - Too close to the RSPCA - noise issues - Too close to the new high school - Size of site outside of WG guidance on good practise - Location regarded by travellers as being unsuitable - Access is difficult | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 4060.K1 | McKim, Mrs Doreen | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |
|---------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 578/ Hartridge Farm Road

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

| Item | Question | Representation Text | Yes/No |
|------|----------|---|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)025 | |
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Hartridge Farm Road | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Ringland wasn't on the original list, the proposed sites are never suitable. One at Hartridge Farm road isn't suitable because of the children at Llanwern High and the site at the allotments isn't because of the main road and pylons. | |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

Site,RepnType: 579/ Former Ringland Allotments,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1401.K1 | Gallagher Estates | Turley Associates | | 21/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | I | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 579/ Former Ringland Allotments

Summary: Oppose Gypsy and Traveller site proposed at former Ringland allotments site

| Item | Question | Representation Text |
|------|----------|---------------------|
|------|----------|---------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1 | Alternative Site Ref Number RAS(D)004 |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Woodlands Site, Ringland |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 3 | Representation Gallaghers Estates support the proposed deletion of the former Ringland allotments as a gypsy and traveller accommodation, contingency allocation (alternative site Ref: RAS(D)004) from the revised LDP. Our comments regarding the deletion of this site from the Revised LDP were submitted during the Revised Deposit LPD consultation and remain relevant to this consultation. |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material No |
|---|---|---------------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why We consider our presence at the hearing session is necessary to allow us to present Gallagher Estates case, elaborate further on the points made within our representations and to ensure the inspector is fully informed. Yes |
|---|---|--|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3844.K2 | Hando, Mr David | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | I | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 579/ Former Ringland Allotments

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation at Former Ringland Allotments

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I write to support representations made by the Newport Traveller Sites Study Group and Ringland Matters representing 10,000 petitions and the Report of the Musker Sumner Partnership commissioned by Ringland Matters. In particular the deletion of RAS(N)027 Hartridge Farm Road and RAS(N)026 Ringland Allotments and consideration of the alternative sites suggested in particular the former Speedway Site and the strategy proposed by the Newport Traveller Site Study Group.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

My starting point is that I am fully in favour of legal, properly run, Council Traveller sites. During my eight years on Newport City Council I consistently argued, with virtually no support, that legal sites were the only way of solving the problems of illegal ones. However, legal sites must be in the right location.

Residential in the Hartridge and Ringland areas have outlines a large number of reasons why the Hartridge Farm Road and Allotment sites are manifestly unsuitable. I will restrict myself to just five reasons why the Hartridge Farm Road site is flawed, rendering the Local Development Plan unsound.

1. That site has long been identified for housing in the Unitary Development Plan. Council committed itself to spending £29m on replacing Hartridge High School, largely by borrowing to be repaid by land sales. Relinquishing that site leaves a £6m gap in Council finances. More, in fact, as the smaller but more prestigious Pwl Pen site would be blighted by the proximity of a traveller site. Therefore, the proposal undermines the Council's financial strategy and renders the LDP unsound.

2. The proposal also undermines the Council's educational strategy for the east of the city. For years school numbers have been unbalanced because of the reluctance of parents to send their children to Hartridge High School because it was out of date and dilapidated, affecting the morale of both pupils and staff. As a consequence Caerleon and St Julian's High Schools have been seriously overcrowded, affecting the quality of what they can offer. If parents were told those schools were full some exercised their right to apply to Caldicot or even Chepstow while others opted for private schools. To rectify this situation the Council decide to invest £29m, largely borrowed, to build a new school and develop a new image in the form of Llanwern High School. The transformation is remarkable. A brand new state of the art school that pupils (and staff!) want to go to without all the disadvantages of the crumbling, spread out old buildings. Morale has soared with attendance, appearance, results, and, vitally, enrolment all on the up. All this will be imperilled by the proximity of a traveller site and the £29m new building could become a very expensive white elephant, while the damaging pressure on Caerleon and St Julian's High Schools will resume. There will be a similarly detrimental affect on Ysgol Gymraeg Casnewydd should a traveller site be just the width of a road away.

3. The RSPCA animal shelter could not continue its highly valued work with a traveller site next door. The shelters' dogs and those of the travellers would set each other off and neither the animals, the residents nor the travellers would have any peace. Likewise, the RSPCA would not allow its staff and volunteer dog walkers to take nervous and damaged dogs past the travellers' site. The shelter would have to move but there is no provision in the LDP for this. The same might be true if houses were built on the site, although current residents have no problem, but funding for resettlement could be allowed for by planning condition.

4. The same is true of the Road Safety Centre which does vital work with youngsters who could be a menace on the roads. Road Safety lessons are a vital part of the curriculum of difficult to educate pupils at the High School. They can walk to the Centre and bussing them elsewhere would put a continuing drain on scarce school resources. No provision for re-location is made in the LDP.

5. The policy of concentration of traveller families is flawed. Lumping three separate families of difficult traditions together would create a large concentration against WG guidelines and common sense. Travellers have talked about a "concentration camp" and a "ghetto". A leading councillor who was involved in devising this policy spoke in Council of putting them all together for ease of control and preventing the pain spreading to other areas. I would suggest that smaller units spread across the community makes far more sense.

For these five reasons and many more put forward by others, such as transforming the lives of the immediately adjacent neighbours, traffic congestion, SDR and railway noise and danger, I maintain that the LDP is unsound. I would particularly stress the undermining of the Council's own financial and educational strategies.

If objectors are expected to put forward alternative sites I would suggest returning to the carefully considered original sites which were recommended by both planners and councillors. There will be objections to all sites and none are perfect. However, difficulties such as flood plain considerations can be overcome. A site that wasn't available when the original five were proposed was the former speedway site. That is probably the best option of all and has the important advantage that the travellers favour it. Despite what has been represented that is emphatically not the case with Hartridge Farm Road and the Allotments. Consultation with the travellers was seriously flawed.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3938.K1 | Newport Traveller Sites Study Group | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 579/ Former Ringland Allotments

Summary: Support deletion of site

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I write on behalf of the Trustees of this charity which was set up to study Newport City Council's proposals for traveller sites and ascertain whether those sites are beneficial to Newport residents, including travellers.

As a result of our study we endorse the submissions made by the Ringland Matters Group on behalf of the ten thousand residents who signed the petitions opposing the Hartridge Farm Road and Ringland Allotments sites and the Report compiled by consultants, the Musker Sumner Partnership, engaged by the Ringland Matters Group.

In particular we call for the deletion of:

RAS(D)026 Ringland Allotments. Briefly, it is unsuitable as it is alongside the busy SDR on a main access to the city, immediately opposite a large housing estate. All amenities are across that road and people have always been reluctant to use the underpass. The site has a power line crossing it and road access for development is planned across it.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3982.K15 | Ringland Matters Group | Musker Sumner Partnership | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

[Additional material submitted - Please click here](#)

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 579/ Former Ringland Allotments

Summary: Support for deletion of land as allocation for G&T site

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(D)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name

Former Ringland Allotments

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

3 3 Representation

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 MSP are instructed by the Ringland Matters Group ('the Group) to report on the Revised Deposit Newport Local Development Plan, (the 'revised LDP') issued for consultation and comment to interested parties . The group has been set up to look at the proposed 'allocation' in the deposit LDP of the residential and transit gypsy and traveller sites at Hartridge Farm Road and the Ringland allotments. This report therefore looks at and assesses the gypsy and traveller aspects of the deposit LDP.

1.2. This report is made to the group and we acknowledge that it can be submitted to Newport City Council by the group as a duly made representation to the revised LDP.

1.3. In line with the requirements of the Local Development Plan Wales (LDPW) and its accompanying regulations 2005, this report sets out to apply the test of 'soundness'. These tests are set out in terms of 'procedural'; 'consistency' and 'coherence and effectiveness'. In this assessment, the key tests of consistency and coherence and effectiveness have been looked at. We have not paid regard to procedural matters as they relate to compliance with the Delivery Agreement, the Community Involvement Scheme and Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment, which are matters for the Government to address.

1.4. However, one procedural matter that does arise is the issue concerning the issue of the revised LDP itself. This revision follows the placing on deposit of the LDP in its original form in 2012. In relation to the groups' interest, that original deposit plan had gypsy and traveller site allocations on land well away from them and so had no effect to them at all. The revised LDP is said to be made by the Officers of the Council under regulation 17 of the 2005 LDP Regulations.

1.5. We have looked accordingly at part 17 of those regulations, which deal with how to make a deposit plan. We can find no provision in them for a revised LDP once it has been placed on deposit. Rather, any changes should be dealt with by way of 'focused changes' to the plan, whereby the appointed Inspector can only make changes to the plan, and these are by way of directions the Council must then follow. The Council has agreement from the Welsh Assembly that a revised LDP may be 'the best way forward', 1 but under the regulations there is no provision for such a revision to be made. Therefore the original deposit LOP should have gone forward to examination with its original gypsy site allocations. The group therefore believe that the revised deposit LDP has been 'concocted' by the newly elected Council and rushed through to avoid those newly elected members having a 'gypsy' site in their own wards. Thus the revision is a political one, not one based on the regulatory requirements. The group find therefore the revised 'process', particularly in relation to the gypsy and traveller site allocations to have been carried out 'in a rush' with incumbent shortfalls, which this report will highlight. We find this 'rush' unsurprising, given that Newport's LDP production is far behind the originally intended four years from 2005, as set out in the 2005 regulations and is now one of the last to be produced in Wales.

2.0. THE TESTS OF SOUNDNESS

2.1. The Planning Acts require all LDP's to be subject to an examination by an independent Inspector. That appointed Inspector will assess the soundness of the plan. That test of soundness relates to the policy content of the plan and the process for its production.

Under these headings, there are '10' tests identified against which the test of soundness will be applied. We have identified five of those 10 tests which are applicable to the concerns of the group. These are:

- test C1 - regard to other development plans; policies and strategies of adjoining areas;
- test C2 - regard to national policy
- test CE1 - coherent strategy and compatibility with neighbouring authorities;
- test CE2 - realistic having regard to alternatives and a robust evidence base and;
- test CE3 - evidence of implementation and monitoring

These tests we now go on to accordingly apply.

3.0. TEST C1

3.1. Section 225 of the Housing Act 2004 requires local authorities to assess the needs of gypsy and traveller accommodation. Guidance on how that 13 to be assessed sets out that it may be beneficial to 'work in partnership at sub regional or regional level' 3 and 'early discussions should take place with other authorities in the region to identify the scope for partnership working' 4.

3.2. Circular 30/2007 states that, following the guidance for Local Market Housing Assessments, the circular guidance 'strongly recommends that local authorities work in partnership with neighbouring authorities as travelling patterns are liable to cross local authority boundaries' 5.

3.3. Despite the above national guidance, the Council's gypsy and traveller strategy in the revised LDP is based, almost solely, on the findings of the Fordham report, published in 2010. Having looked at that report, we can find no recommendation or assessment of any cross boundary working with adjacent authorities. This may be because this aspect was not included in the Council's brief to Fordham. In any event that needs' report can only be used to inform the Council's policy, it is not the policy itself. However, the revised LDP policy appears to be based solely on it, thereby completely ignoring the policy advice of Government and thereby, in our view, failing to meet test C1 of the LDP regulations.

3.4. The Government's overall approach to gypsy and traveller provision has been assessed numerically, and this is estimated to be between 275 - 305 families to meet need and family increase to 2016 . Whilst these figures can be further revised as a result of each local authority carrying out its own needs assessment, there is no paper, policy or report in the revised LDP which shows how provision in adjoining authorities or across the region or sub region has been taken into account, affects or otherwise the projected needs base for Newport or its gypsy -traveller provision . For example, in relation to the provision of transit sites, Circulars 30/2007 makes it clear that such provision is an across boundary issue. We are aware, for example, that Cardiff is actively seeking a major transit site along the M4 corridor and yet in the revised LDP no account is taken as to whether or not such provision will meet the transit needs of Newport from such a site, which will be only a few miles away and

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

on the major transport links through the region, therefore meeting transit needs. Without any such assessment, transit provision in this revised LDP is fundamentally flawed as it ignores the Government's approach to such provision. On permanent sites, the same applies. That is that the numbers required to be provided may (or may not) be affected by provision in adjoining or nearby authorities. No assessment is made, so the revised LDP assumptions on numbers required to be provided in the Newport area cannot be relied on as 'need' in the area, because there is no apparent basis to assess that need in the region. There is no assessment as to how the numbers of permanent pitches proposed for Newport in the revised LDP affect or otherwise the overall provision in the region, or Wales as a whole. It cannot therefore be known whether the overall targets identified by the Government's own assessment is met or whether an overprovision is made and whether that overprovision will result in immigration from other areas if such overprovision is made, to the detriment of Newport residents. We say there is a detriment because it is acknowledged that a gypsy or traveller site adjacent to existing housing will result in community disharmony".

4.0. TEST C2

4.1. The most obvious conflict with national policy in relation to gypsy and traveller sites in the revised LDP is the size of the permanent site proposed at Hartridge Farm Road. 43 pitches are proposed at the site, which could be the equivalent of 172 individual caravans (assuming 4 caravans per pitch). National guidance on site design of such sites set out quite clearly that they should ideally be no more than 12 pitches and taking into account local circumstances and need, no more than 15-20 pitches". The proposal at Hartridge Farm Road is over twice that recommended size, completely in conflict with that national guidance and therefore a failure of test C2.

4.2. We have had a look at the selection criterion used by the Council for site selection of gypsy and traveller sites. The actual criteria used by the Scurtney Review Assessment in 2012, relate to various points but none relate to site size". This is despite the fact that in that same paper, it is outlined that consultation by the Council with the gypsy and traveller community in 2010, revealed that a 'small site' was desirable (it is in fact placed at the top of the list10). This however appears to have been ignored. We can find no paper or report either in the LDP or its documents that sets out why a site 3.5 times the size (43/12) of that recommended in Government guidance is proposed. This the Council is required to do if this part of the test C2 is to be met.

4.3. National policy requires that the gypsy and traveller community be involved at an early stage in the preparation of LDP's. The Council's Gypsy and Traveller accommodation background paper states that since 2010, the Council has dramatically increased its interaction with that community. However, we can find no papers to the revised LDP that set out what those consultations were, what questions or what options were put to that community. Thus that part of the LDP process is not transparent enough to enable other stakeholders, such as the community around the proposed residential site, to assess how extensive or appropriate that consultation has been or whether the proposed allocation reflects that community's desires and wants. Whilst this should be set out in the Community Involvement Scheme as part of the LDP process, we have still been unable to identify for example, if any of the suggested sites were put forward or proposed by that community. What is clear is that the Council's selection criterion used for the site selection does not have any criteria based on whether the gypsy and traveller community want the sites or not. That runs contrary to Government advice because it is not identified to what extent the sites put forward arise from work with the gypsy and traveller community, whether they are suitable for them or which, if any sites, are put forward by them. This should be made clear and transparent in the LDP and in accordance with Government advice". Further J without such information being readily available and transparent, it cannot be relied upon as fully informing the LDP process and hence, site selection.

4.4. On the matter of site selection, the criterion the Council has used appear to be selectively ignoring Government guidance as to what, and what weight, should be attached to them. The criterion used for site selection in the first and second rounds relate primarily to avoiding environmentally sensitive areas, proximity principles (including settlement boundaries) and whether or not the sites are owned by the Council. 12 Circular 30/2007 sets out that in terms of site selection, sites in, or near, existing settlements should be considered first. However, it also states that rural settings are acceptable in principle. In such areas it states that over rigid application of national or LOP policies that seek a reduction in car borne travel would not be appropriate. It seems to us that the selection criteria used by the Council by applying the settlement boundary/rural exception criterion, discounts automatically this part of possible sites suitable in accordance with that Government guidance. In other words, all rural sites are dismissed. That is not what Government guidance says and so again, the selection process fails test C2 as no such sites have been considered.

4.5. National guidance on site constraint policies also seem to have been ignored on the sites selected in the revised LDP for gypsy and traveller accommodation. The transient site proposed at Llanwern is steeply sloping and has national grid pylons over it. Not only that, but the site sits on the side of one of the main, if not the main, arterial roads into and out of Newport. The site is clearly visible by users of that road. Placing the site here has the potential to undermine the well landscaped visual amenity of the rest of that route, to the detriment of the well being of Newport as a whole.

4.6. The Hartridge Road residential site has the main railway line along its southern border and the main SDR route to the north. This will create noise for that site unsuitable for residential occupation and be a potential hazard. Whilst there are underpasses under the OTR route, these are unpleasant and not used. Local knowledge confirms that they have been used as 'ambush sites' in the past. Planning guidance advises against putting such sites near hazards>.

5.0. TEST CE1

5.1. We have already largely covered the point of compatibility with adjoining authorities in the section on test C1, which is regard to be had to the development plans of adjoining authorities. We can find no report or assessment of any regard to what provision adjoining authorities are making for gypsy and traveller provision or how this may affect provision or otherwise of such sites in Newport. Whilst each authority has to make provision for its own communities it may contain, national guidance makes it clear that gypsy and travellers are a cross boundary issue and therefore any strategy should account for provision or otherwise in adjoining authorities.

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

5.2. It seems to us to be unsurprising that such a cross boundary approach has not been undertaken in the revised LDP. That is because the gypsy and traveller issue has only recently been tackled in the LDP evidence base since 2010 and given the priority of the Council to now issue its LDP (as it is far behind its timetable), the Council has simply taken the short route of applying directly the 'need' identified in the Fordham report and applied it to a single site.

5.3 Given that there is no evidence base showing how Newport's provision fits in with or is affected by adjoining authorities or how the provision for such sites fits in with the Government's projections for gypsy and traveller sites in Wales¹⁵, and there is no evidence of cooperation between Newport and any other authority¹⁶, this test is also failed.

6.0. TEST CE2

6.1. The revised LDP strategy for gypsy and travellers relies, almost solely, on the Fordham needs assessment. The strategy simply takes the findings of that report in terms of numbers and then finds a site big enough to accommodate it. That is not a realistic means of approaching a strategy for gypsy and traveller sites.

6.2. The Fordham report finds that the 'need' in Newport is for 29 additional residential pitches over the next 10 years¹⁷. The revised LDP strategy is to provide for 43 additional residential pitches¹⁸. This difference in numbers of pitches to be provided is only explained in the background paper as 'through this interaction' - that being interaction with the gypsy and traveller community since the production of the Fordham report in 2010. We can find no report or assessment in the LDP which explains how this figure is arrived at or why. The Fordham report arrives at the figure of 29 additional residential pitches as that includes an allowance of 25 pitches to accommodate need as it stands now and a 3% growth factor¹⁹. Even allowing for natural growth beyond 2019, as allowed for in the Fordham report, to 2026, the figure does not come anywhere near the 43 pitches put forward in the revised LDP. Without the evidence base to clearly show how this figure of 43 pitches is arrived at in the LDP, the base for it is not robust and is unrealistic, thereby failing test CE2.

6.3. The methodology for the revised LDP for gypsies and travellers is to place all the residential pitches on one site, namely Hartridge Farm Road. We can find no rationale for why that method of dealing with this issue is adopted in the revised LDP as the methodology for doing so is not explained. Further the policy is to provide all the projected need of 43 pitches at once (the Council say the site will be 'phased' but we do not consider that to be realistic once the site is operational). Again it is not explained in the LDP documents why this should be the case. The Fordham report identifies that 25 additional pitches are needed in Newport over the next ten years²⁰. Of these, the Fordham report recommends that 14 pitches should be provided on social rented pitches (Le. Council or public body owned) over the next five years²¹. The policy for gypsy and traveller provision is not however designed in this way if all the pitches for the whole LDP period (including the extra 14 over and above the Fordham report to make the total of 43 pitches proposed) are to be provided on one site. We cannot see any control mechanism in the revised LDP to achieve phasing. It is more realistic that once the site is operational, it will simply 'fill up' from the start. This is especially so as such a large site will attract 'overspill' from adjacent authorities and we have already pointed out that that issue has not been addressed in the revised LDP.

6.4. It seems to us therefore that the revised LDP strategy for gypsy and traveller provision is not realistic in that it is not formulated to reflect the findings of the needs assessment. When looking at approaches in other areas, for example Pembrokeshire, the LDP, (which has been accepted as sound by an Inspector), their approach is to make some initial provision and then by review periodically, to have further sites if found to be needed. Thus the site provision is spread out on smaller sites over a longer period if shown to be needed by review. We are not aware that this revised LDP has considered, or it is not shown in the LDP documents, any alternative strategy for site provision over the plan period. This it could have done if the Fordham report had been interpreted differently. Thus the revised LDP is not realistic having regard to alternatives and thus the strategy adopted is not based on a robust evidence base. Test CE2 is also therefore failed.

6.5. The identified problem in the revised LDP strategy of providing the gypsy and traveller site 'en masse' in those numbers at the Hartridge Farm Road site is that it will overwhelm the existing residential population there, which is small scale and rural in the lanes behind Llanwrn High School. A traveller/gypsy site of this size, which will also have to provide on site employment facilities, storage, livestock provision, will completely change the character of that area for those residents, not to mention for the two adjacent schools. That is not a sound basis on which to formulate the strategy for traveller/gypsy provision, which as guidance suggests, ought to be formulated to allow better integration and inclusion with existing local communities.

7.0. TEST CE3

7.1. The LDP is required to show evidence of how the suggested sites are to be implemented and how they are to be monitored. The reason for the monitoring is so that the LDP can be adjusted to suit new or changing circumstances.

7.2. With regard to implementation of the Hartridge Farm Road site and the Ringland allotment site at Llanwrn, obvious problems are evident for which we cannot find any evidence in the LDP as to how they are to be addressed. First, with regard to the transit/residential site at Llanwrn, this is an allotment site. There is specific legislation covering allotments. They are the Small Holdings and Allotment Act 1908 and The Allotments Act 1925. In brief, these set out that land purchased by local authorities as allotments must not be disposed of without Ministerial Consent²². We can find no evidence in the LDP of such consent being obtained. That consent requires provision to be made for allotment holders displaced. We can see nowhere in the LDP that allows for this. Further, local authorities must assess the demand for allotments in the area and if there is, there is a statutory duty to provide them. Further still, allotments form part of the amenity provision of open and recreational

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

space in an area. We can find no calculation as to whether the loss of the allotments to a transit/residential site use would lead to a shortfall of such provision in the area.

7.3. Second, as regards the residential site at Hartridge Farm Road, there are existing uses on that land which are the RSPCA and the Road Safety Centre. We understand these are on a long term lease from the Council. Lease provisions are set out in terms that they have to be renewed, unless the occupier chooses not to do so. We cannot find any reference in the LDP as to two these uses will be dealt with. Should they remain in situ, there will be conflict of use between them and the proposed residential gypsy/traveller site, particularly the RSPCA centre in terms of noise from animals, particularly dogs, much to the detriment of neighbours around the site.

7.4. The Welsh Assembly Government requires a biannual caravan count to be done in each local authority area²⁴. The revised LDP policy with regard to gypsy and traveller sites proposes a 'once and for all' solution by placing all perceived 'need' on one residential site. This 'up front' loading of the policy does not allow for any variation in need that may occur over the plan period and this will be known as a result of the required caravan counts. This not only inflexible, but also no policies are allowed for in the revised LDP for possible adjustments, up or down, to numbers needed. The policy approach should, in our view, be aimed at providing the immediate 14 pitches on Council or public body owned land with the other 15 pitches provided on smaller private sites, as the Fordham report suggests. The additional pitches taking the number up to 43 should not be included at this stage, but a flexible policy introduced into the LDP to take account of the biannual counts. In this way, the swamping of an existing community by such a large residential site could be both avoided initially and dealt with as part of the review process of the LDP. This would allow for monitoring to take place. As the revised LDP policies do not so this, in our view, test CE3 is failed as there is no provision for monitoring in the revised LDP with regard to gypsy and traveller provision.

8.0. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDINGREMARKS

8.1. In our review of the revised LDP with regard to gypsy and traveller provision , we have found a number of shortfalls as regards to the test of 'soundness' to be applied . As an overview, we are not surprised as looking at the overall process, it appears to us that the gypsy and traveller policy has attempted to be revised as part of the LDP process in a very tight timescale. This is not helped by the single residential site chosen to accommodate the perceived need, which will result in one of the largest residential gypsy/traveller sites in Europe. This will totally swamp the existing local Hartridge community and such provision flies in the face of national policy for such sites with regard to size. Neither is the revised LDP further helped by the apparent dismissal in the site selection criterion of existing or unauthorised encampments or any site outside the urban boundary. That is not what Government guidance on this issue sets out. Further, we can see no evidence in the revised LDP of any cross boundary liaison or any assessment as to how the policy put forward fits in with adjacent strategies or the regional picture of the provision for residential and, in particular, transit sites . Without that being done, we fail to see how the revised LDP can be judged to be sound as the evidence base used is not robust and cannot be relied on.

| | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | Yes |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why All 15 sites listed ass attached Highly emotive The large number of residents represented by the group The large number of residents supporting the group | |
|---|---|---|--|

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 3999.K2 | Harvey, Cllr Debbie | | | 12/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 579/ Former Ringland Allotments

Summary: Support the deletion of the Former Ringland Allotments G&T allocation.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Ringland Allotments

3 3 Representation

As we are now in a 6 week consultation regarding the Alternative Sites Register for the LDP and the Gypsy and Traveller sites, we are writing to you to support the case for the removal of the Hartridge and Ringland sites.

We do not feel that the two sites were the right choice from the outset given that the financial loss on the land would be approx. £5M and the current climate as it is that figure is simply too high a price to sustain. In addition there are the other implications on the wildlife.

So in short we support the proposal to delete Hartridge Gypsy & Traveller sites from the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4000.K1 | Green, Mr & Mrs M | | | 13/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 579/ Former Ringland Allotments

Summary: Support the deletion of the Former Ringland Allotment G&T site allocation.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Ringland Allotments

3 3 Representation

My Councillor has informed me that we are now in a 6 week consultation regarding the Alternative Sites Register for the LDP and the Gypsy and Traveller sites, we are writing to you to support the case for the removal of the Hartridge and Ringland sites.

We do not think that the two sites were the right choice as that land would have serious implications on the road leading to the schools and also on the SDR. There is so much traffic on the school days leading to and from the schools onto the SDR and we feel that any further traffic burden placed on that area will be detrimental.

So in conclusion we support the proposal to delete Hartridge Gypsy and Traveller sites from the LDP.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4012.K1 | Redmond, Mr Andrew | | | 22/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | S | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 579/ Former Ringland Allotments

Summary: Support the deletion of Gypsy and Traveller site at Former Ringland Allotments

| Item | Question | Representation Text | |
|------|----------|---|----|
| 2 | 2 | Alternative Site Name Former Ringland Allotments | |
| 3 | 3 | Representation Choosing one of the three above sites will damage the work done to improve the perception of the Ringland and Alway areas of Newport. A lot of time, effort and money have been invested in what has traditionally been seen as a 'rough' part of the city, and this will undo all of the good work done. People have invested their hard-earned money into the 'Broadheath' redevelopment and this will damage any trust in Newport City Council, especially as locating the travellers at any of the above sites will then affect the local housing prices. I also hope that a community known for its lack of contributions to the social funds (i.e. Tax, National Insurance etc.) are contributing to the cost of the works involved in creating such a site, and also be responsible for maintaining the facility to an agreed standard. I have no objection to their way of life, or their freedom to choose that way of life, but I do object to paying for it with my tax contributions. They should be either wholly responsible for the construction of such sites, or be made to contribute to the local community by paying rent and council tax whilst they are resident within the boundaries of the city. | |
| 4 | 4 | Additional Material | No |
| 5 | 5 | Speaking at Public Examination, and why | No |

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4060.K2 | McKim, Mrs Doreen | | | 11/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 579/ Former Ringland Allotments

Summary: Supports proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)026

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Former Ringland Allotments

3 3 Representation
Ringland wasn't on the original list, the proposed sites are never suitable. One at Hartridge Farm road isn't suitable because of the children at Llanwern High and the site at the allotments isn't because of the main road and pylons.

The travellers had already voiced their opinions at the meeting that they preferred the old speedway site. The allotment site isn't suitable as it is too near Ringland housing estate, as they (travellers) will entice trouble with gangs from Ringland going through the underpass causing a nightmare for the residents living near the underpass.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Site,RepnType: 582/ Glebelands,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3507.K16 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 582/ Glebelands

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of housing commitment Glebelands from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
We do not support this deletion.

Site,RepnType: 583/ Herbert Road & Enterprise House,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3507.K17 | Newport CC Property Services | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 583/ Herbert Road & Enterprise House

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of housing proposal Herbert Road from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
We do not support this deletion.

Site,RepnType: 588/ Duffryn Link Road,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 47.K15 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|---------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 588/ Duffryn Link Road

Summary: Oppose the deletion of the Duffryn Link Road.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
RAS(D)001 Duffryn Link Road Proposed deletion MCC would oppose the deletion of the Duffryn link road proposal from the revised deposit LDP. The completion/extension of the SDR would lead to easing the traffic burden around the already congested junction 28 of the M4. The proposed route would enhance the business opportunities and access to the Celtic Springs business site and encourage both growth on the already developed site and also assist with access for the workforce and production. The proposed route would benefit the wider community in enhancing the travel links in the region necessary for social and domestic journeys such that travel times would be reduced at peak times.

4 4 Additional Material No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1600.K17 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 588/ Duffryn Link Road

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of the site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)022

2 2 Alternative Site Name
Duffryn Link Road

3 3 Representation
RAS(D)001

The Duffryn Link Road is the missing link on the southern bypass around Newport. The designation for a major road scheme should remain as the construction of this section of road will have many benefits for the people of Newport. It will ease congestion at the Ebbw Bridge and Tredegar roundabouts, provide a route around all of Newport at times of congestion from Magor to Castleton on the M4 and provide good access to the proposed station at Coedkernew from both east and west.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K31 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 588/ Duffryn Link Road

Summary: Objection to the proposed deletion

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)001 Duffryn Link Road

This final section of the Southern Distributor Road is essential in proposals to relieve congestion on Junction 28 Tredegar Park Roundabout M4. This road will also provide an enhanced link to the proposed Coedkernew Railway Station and assist in the Councils aspirations for a park and ride facility.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3683.K78 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 588/ Duffryn Link Road

Summary: Support the proposed deletion

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
 Duffryn Link Road
 Due to the location within the Gwent Levels – St
 Brides SSSI, we welcome the proposed deletion of
 this site.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 3692.K5 | Lawrence, Tracey | | | 14/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | I | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 588/ Duffryn Link Road

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
 RAS(D)001

2 2 Alternative Site Name
 Duffryn Link Road

3 3 Representation
 I request that the extension of the SDR (Duffryn Link Road) is completed to ease congestion in and around Newport.
 However I strongly request NCC improve traffic information at Tredegar Roundabout Jct 28 as traffic enters the slip road and will join congestion when they could utilise the existing SDR and therefore improve travel links and long queues at peak hours.
 Consideration should be given to natural surroundings and residents during design and subsequent construction of the SDR.

Retain in LDP.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3849.K18 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 588/ Duffryn Link Road

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of Duffryn Link Road from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)001

The Duffryn Link Road is the missing link on the southern bypass around Newport. The designation for a major road scheme should remain as the construction of this section of road will have many benefits for the people of Newport. It will ease congestion at the Ebbw Bridge and Tredegar roundabouts, provide a route around all of Newport at times of congestion from Magor to Castleton on the M4 and provide good access to the proposed station at Coedkernew from both east and west.

Site,RepnType: 589/ M4 Relief Road,

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 47.K16 | Marshfield Community Council | | | 16/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | W | | | M | |
|--------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 589/ M4 Relief Road

Summary: Oppose the deletion of the M4 Relief Road route.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)022 M4 Relief Road Proposed deletion MCC would oppose the deletion of the M4 relief road proposal from the revised deposit LDP. The alternative route for the M4 relief road would enhance the business prospects of not only the immediate MCC area but also the wider business community due to the bottleneck experienced by business users of the M4 when approaching Newport. The delays experienced have stifled development of business links and deterred development and expansion of the business community. Peak time travel on the existing M4 is subject to the volume of traffic causing delays and often accidents which would be expected to decrease with the alternative route offered via the relief road. The proposed route would enhance the business opportunities to the region and encourage both growth on already developed sites and also assist with access for the workforce and production. The proposed route would benefit the wider community in enhancing the travel links in the region necessary for social and domestic journeys such that travel times would be reduced at peak times.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 1600.K18 | White, Cllr Richard | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 589/ M4 Relief Road

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number
RAS(D)022

2 2 Alternative Site Name
M4 Relief Road

3 3 Representation
RAS(D)022

Whilst I do not agree with the concept of an M4 Relief Road I do think this designation should remain as it will have a containing effect on any future development to the south of Newport.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3663.K32 | Newport CC Highways | | | 17/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 589/ M4 Relief Road

Summary: Objection to the proposed deletion

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
RAS(D)022 M4 Relief Road
The Welsh Government is currently undertaking consultations on the options for providing a new M4 south of Newport. This allocation safeguarding the route must, therefore, remain until the Welsh Government directs otherwise.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3683.K79 | Natural Resources Wales | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 589/ M4 Relief Road

Summary: NRW are advising Welsh Government on this proposal and have no further comments

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

M4 Relief Road

Welsh Government has published a draft plan which is under consultation until December 2013. NRW are advising Welsh Government as part of this consultation. We have no further comment to make at this time.

3692.K7 Lawrence, Tracey

14/10/2013

E

S

I

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 589/ M4 Relief Road

Summary: Support for proposed deletion of site from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Alternative Site Ref Number

RAS(D)022

2 2 Alternative Site Name

M4 Safe guarding

3 3 Representation

I agree and confirm the request to delete the M4 corridor safe guarding from the LDP.

NCC and WG should concentrate on alternative means of transport including the extension of SDLR and direct traffic to this alternative route during peak travel times.

There should also be consideration to improve train lines and increase local stations and introduce free car parking to encourage commuters to use the train.

These options should be explored prior to WG and NCC even considering construction of further grey hard landscape around Newport and destroying little green area and wildlife we have remaining.

Strongly agree with the deletion of this site.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

Yes

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 3849.K19 | Suller, Cllr Tom | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | O | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 589/ M4 Relief Road

Summary: Objection to proposed deletion of M4 Relief Road from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

RAS(D)022

Whilst I do not agree with the concept of an M4 Relief Road I do think this designation should remain as it will have a containing effect on any future development to the south of Newport.

4124.K4 Lawrence, Shirley

18/10/2013

E

S

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 589/ M4 Relief Road

Summary: Support the proposed deletion of M4 Safeguarding from Revised LDP

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I agree and confirm the request to delete the M4 corridor safe guarding from the LDP.

NCC and WG should concentrate on alternative means of transport including the extension of SDLR and direct traffic to this alternative route during peak travel times.

There should also be consideration to improve train lines and increase local stations and introduce free car parking to encourage commuters to use the train.

These options should be explored prior to WG and NCC even considering construction of further grey hard landscape around Newport and destroying little green area and wildlife we have remaining.

Strongly agree with the deletion of this site.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

Site,RepnType: 591/ Unspecified Site,

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 49.K1 | Nash Community Council | | | 07/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: Nash Community Council accept the Newport LDP.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
For the attention of Mark Hand

I confirm that Nash Community Council accept the LDP Plan.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 104.K1 | Western Power Distribution | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | C | | M | |

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: Western Power's considerations.

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

I write in respect of the subject document and have been instructed on behalf of Western Power Distribution to make the following consultation response.

Western Power Distribution may have a number of strategic electricity distribution circuits (which can operate at 132,000 Volts, 66,000 Volts and 33,000 Volts) in some of the area's being considered for development. These circuits may run both underground and as overhead lines (on either towers/pylons or wood poles).

Generally, Western Power Distribution would expect developers of a site to pay to divert less strategic electricity circuits operating at 11,000 Volts (11kV) or below. This may include under grounding some 11kV and low voltage overhead lines as necessary.

Western Power Distribution would normally seek to retain the position of electricity circuits operating at 132,000 Volts (132kV) and 66,000 Volts (66kV) and in some cases 33,000 Volts (33kV), particularly if the diversion of such circuits placed a financial obligation on Western Power Distribution to either divert or underground them as WPD would not be party to any planning application and any such obligation would also go against the statutory and regulatory requirement on Western Power Distribution to operate an economic and efficient electricity distribution system. Assuming the required minimum statutory clearances can be maintained and WPD can access its pylons/poles, WPD does not generally have any restriction on the type of development possible in proximity to its strategic overhead lines but it would be sensible for planning guidance and layout of developments to take WPD's position into account and consider uses compatible with the retention of strategic overhead lines, for example such as parking, estate roads, commercial uses or open space, within their immediate proximity. It is worth noting that any existing circuits crossing the proposed development areas in the document may run both overhead and underground. In any case WPD should be consulted on detail at an early stage and WPD are always keen to discuss larger sites with the local authorities at an early stage, so that constraints can be taken into account and sites planned in the most effective way.

I trust the information provided is satisfactory and I look forward to receiving your confirmation of receipt of this representation in due course along with the appropriate consultation number for future reference. Should you require any additional information or want to discuss or clarify any matter with a representative from WPD, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1452.K1 | Tir Gwernau | | | 11/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | C | | M | |
|---------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: We will be quite happy with the Inspectors observations.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We will be quite happy with the Inspectors observations.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3341.K1 | Orosz, Mrs Agnes | | | 25/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|---------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: Object to the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I totally against for anywhere Gypsy and Traveller sites, because nobody allowed to live free, without paying contributions!!! And in fact, they are wealthy to save thousand council tax, not like homeles, or persioners. Please don't protect them at all! They are not vulnerable, just want to avoid paying tax.

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why No

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3738.K10 | John, Major (Retd) W M | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |
|----------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: Support the Revised Deposit Settlement Boundary around Langstone.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

With regard to the Langstone ward in general, the existing settlement boundaries should be retained as per the Revised LDP June 2013.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3814.K7 | Saunders, Peter & Teresa | | | 15/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | S | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: Support the settlement boundary for Langstone.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

We recommend that the existing settlement boundaries be retained, as per the Revised LDP of June 2013.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3915.K1 | Lewis, Mr Matthew | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and traveller sites in Ringland area

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I disagree with the gypsy site being built in ringland area

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3919.K1 | Lloyd, Ms Nikta | | | 06/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | E | | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: Object to proposed Gypsy and traveller sites in Ringland

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I disagree of the build of the gypsy site going in Ringland

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| 4009.K1 | Ellis, C | | | 19/09/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: Concern over the impact of sites.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

I am concerned over rubbish (flytipping) if anysite is going to be properly policed maintained and most of all can we be assured that the price of our properties does not depreciated dramatically that we cant sell.

4 4 Additional Material

No

5 5 Speaking at Public Examination, and why

No

4127.K10 Peter Jackson, Daniel Christopher &

21/10/2013



C

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 591/ Unspecified Site

Summary: Supports Langstone settlement boundary.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

With regard to the Langstone ward in general, the existing settlement boundaries should be retained as per the Revised LDP June 2013.

Site,RepnType: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites,

2201.K1 Tyler, Anne

18/10/2013



P

M

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation

See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3704.K1 | Jones, Mrs Tanya Closs | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3763.K1 | Anderson, Jennifer | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3803.K1 | Sanges, Rosemarie | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3819.K1 | Griffiths, Ms Linda | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3864.K1 | Meakin, Mr & Mrs | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4076.K1 | , JP Cooper and Family | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted

The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)013 - Land off Magor Rd, Langstone

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)015 - Land at Coldra Roundabout

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)042 - Longleat, Chepstow Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)049 - Oak Court (Gorelands proposals)

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(A)003 - Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site)

I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra

The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4095.K1 | Rey, Mrs D | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted

The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)013 - Land off Magor Rd, Langstone

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)015 - Land at Coldra Roundabout

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)042 - Longleat, Chepstow Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)049 - Oak Court (Gorelands proposals)

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(A)003 - Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site)

I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra

The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4096.K1 | Miles, D G | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted

The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)013 - Land off Magor Rd, Langstone

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)015 - Land at Coldra Roundabout

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)042 - Longleat, Chepstow Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)049 - Oak Court (Gorelands proposals)

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(A)003 - Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site)

I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra

The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4097.K1 | Miles, Mrs G A | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted

The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)013 - Land off Magor Rd, Langstone

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)015 - Land at Coldra Roundabout

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)042 - Longleat, Chepstow Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)049 - Oak Court (Gorelands proposals)

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(A)003 - Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site)

I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra

The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4129.K1 | Sanges, S | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4130.K1 | Bowen, H | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4131.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4132.K1 | Grigg, H | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4133.K1 | Shepherd, Mr B | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4134.K1 | Richards, Mr D G | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4135.K1 | Wagstaff, G H | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4136.K1 | Hemingway, Maureen | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4137.K1 | Shepherd, Mrs C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4138.K1 | Kendall, Mrs G | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4139.K1 | Branch, Mrs V | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4140.K1 | Fekler, E A | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4141.K1 | Richards, Mr W | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4142.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4143.K1 | Francis, M D | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4144.K1 | Petly, Jacqueline | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4145.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4146.K1 | Daniels, Margaret | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4147.K1 | Richards, Mrs S M | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4148.K1 | Kane, Mr Tim | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4149.K1 | Daniels, J E | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4150.K1 | Murn, Mr D | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4151.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4152.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4153.K1 | Juchau, Mrs Shirley A | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4154.K1 | Jones, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4155.K1 | Mountford, M J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4156.K1 | Griffiths, Mrs Christine | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4157.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4158.K1 | Murray, R | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4159.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4160.K1 | Young, Rachel | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4161.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4162.K1 | Shuttle, Mrs A | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4163.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4164.K1 | Harding, C L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4165.K1 | Brett, E | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4166.K1 | Wilson, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4167.K1 | Percial, N | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4168.K1 | Page, Mrs Cher | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4169.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4170.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4171.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4172.K1 | Morgan, J F | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4173.K1 | Dack, Mr & Mrs | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4174.K1 | Ridge, M | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4175.K1 | Tobin, K | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4176.K1 | Blackborow, J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4177.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4178.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4179.K1 | Bagley, C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4180.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4181.K1 | O'Brien, Kate | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4182.K1 | Beckett, J M | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4183.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4184.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4185.K1 | King, S | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4186.K1 | Mogford, R C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4187.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4188.K1 | Wilson, J A | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4189.K1 | Perry, Mrs L P | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4190.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4191.K1 | Tadman, M G | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4192.K1 | Belle, R G | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4193.K1 | Young, A M | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment.

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4194.K1 | Masters, David | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4195.K1 | Bryant, J W | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4196.K1 | T M Allen, K Allen & | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4197.K1 | Troddyn, T H | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4198.K1 | Primmer, Kevin | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4199.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4200.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4201.K1 | Penrose, I | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4202.K1 | , Harding | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4203.K1 | Straw, I | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4204.K1 | Manley, Jill | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4205.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4206.K1 | Clarke, Mrs P | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4207.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4208.K1 | Rowlands, Sian | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4209.K1 | Tom, Mr & Mrs | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4210.K1 | Shawcross, | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4211.K1 | Lea, M C | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4212.K1 | Doe, Sarah | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4213.K1 | Melvin, Mr J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4214.K1 | Jarett, M | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-----------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4215.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4216.K1 | Sandeman, I J | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4217.K1 | Lane, Mr M | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4218.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4219.K1 | Watkins, L | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4220.K1 | Webster, S | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4221.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4222.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4223.K1 | Hobson, S A | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4224.K1 | Ash, B A S | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,ReprnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| Rep'n/Para/Policy | Representor | Agent | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source | Type | Mode | Status | Status Modified |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|--------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4225.K1 | , The Occupier | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4226.K1 | Hale, Mrs A | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4227.K1 | Jones, Miss Rhiannon | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|

Document:Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question Representation Text

3 3 Representation
See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4228.K1 | Jones, Mr Donald | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

3 3 Representation

See 4229.K1 for full representation

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 4229.K1 | Jones, Mrs Jayne | | | 18/10/2013 | <input type="checkbox"/> | P | | | M | |

Document: Alternative Site Register at Revised Stage

Site: 593/ The Langstone Proforma Sites

Summary: Object to any new development in Langstone but support the Special Landscape Area amendment

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

by: Site,RepnType

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=K; Status=M

| <i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i> | <i>Representor</i> | <i>Agent</i> | <i>Accession No</i> | <i>Date Lodged</i> | <i>Late?</i> | <i>Source</i> | <i>Type</i> | <i>Mode</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Status Modified</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|

3 3 Representation

RAS(N)008 - G and T site on the A449 to be re-submitted

The LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in July 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals. This site is not large enough to accommodate the identified Gypsy and Traveller transit site need of 7 pitches, and the Welsh Government has objected to the use of the A449 access roads. The remaining roads are single track country lanes that are completely unsuitable for cars or vans towing large caravans, which would be an obvious essential requirement for a transit site by definition.

RAS(N)010 - Land off Langstone Rise

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply with the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)013 - Land off Magor Rd, Langstone

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside of the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)015 - Land at Coldra Roundabout

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)042 - Longleat, Chepstow Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary and is an inappropriate location for additional residential development, being very remote from the limited amenities available in Langstone and being a prominent intrusion into the countryside. Additional housing land is not needed as the LDP allocates sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites that comply that the Plan's brownfield strategy. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)043 - Land off Langstone Court Road

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(N)049 - Oak Court (Gorelands proposals)

I confirm that this site should not be included as a new site, it is outside the current settlement boundary. The LDP has a brownfield strategy with sufficient, acceptable and deliverable sites to meet the City's housing need while providing range and choice. Additional greenfield housing sites are not needed. Even if additional land were required, this proposed site would result in a significant and prominent incursion into the countryside and would be a disproportionate addition to the community of Langstone. Therefore, the LDP as accepted and proposed by the City Council in June 2013 is acceptable and strongly disagree to the inclusion and submitted proposal of this new site as set out in Part A under New Site Proposals.

RAS(A)003 - Land North of A48 (includes Goreland/Oak Court site)

I strongly support the proposed alternative use for this site as Special Landscape Area and recommend its inclusion in the revision and amendment of the LDP.

RAS(A)011 - North East Coldra

The proposed alternative use is unacceptable and has highway safety implications and preference is for the existing buffer of countryside between Langstone and the urban environment to be retained.
