

ES4.9



Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council

Local Development Plan

Hearing Session 4: Housing Sites

Wednesday 27 June 2012

Examination 2012

Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council Submission

Examination Statement Reference No:	ES4.9
Submission date:	15th June 2012

SESSION 4 HOUSING SITES

Introduction

This Statement has been prepared by Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council in order to help facilitate appropriate discussion at the Housing Site Hearing Session. The Paper provides a response to the questions set by the Planning Inspector (Mr Vincent Maher).

Where the Council does not intend to provide any additional written evidence the Inspector's attention is directed to the relevant part of the Evidence Base, which in the view of the Council addresses the matters raised. The paper will not repeat evidence previously submitted for consideration.

The Council's detailed response to the representations received to the Housing Sites are contained in the Report of Representations (**SD07b**).

Council Response to Inspector's Questions (questions in bold)

1. Is the allocation of housing sites based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal including testing of reasonable alternatives and does it represent the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances? Have the site selection and policy designation processes been based on appropriate criteria supported by a clear audit trail?

Is the allocation of housing sites based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal including testing of reasonable alternatives and does it represent the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances?

Yes. It is considered that the allocation of housing sites is based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal including testing of reasonable alternatives and represents the most appropriate strategy.

The Plan has been subject to a thorough and comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal throughout its preparation which is set out in the following reports:

- **SD04a:** Sustainability Appraisal (March 2011)
- **SD04b:** Sustainability Appraisal Appendices (March 2011)
- **SD04c:** Sustainability Appraisal – Non Technical Summary (March 2011)
- **SD24:** Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Scoping Report (Nov 2007)
- **SD25:** Draft Preferred Strategy
- **SD26:** Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report

The reports identified above record all the sustainability work undertaken in predicting and evaluating the effects of strategic options and preferred policies as well as the selection of preferred sites for the delivery of development.

It is considered that the Preferred Strategy (**SD25**) put forward a sufficient variety of options based on overall levels of change and spatial distribution.

Option 1: Regeneration (Continuation of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Strategy) was considered a negative growth scenario. If the level of growth contained in the UDP for 117 houses per annum was used as a dwelling led projection it would result in a continued loss of population. This is due to different assumptions about household size than was previously used. As there is already a sufficient supply of committed housing sites to meet this requirement there would be no need to release any more housing sites. However, there would be very little opportunity to deliver affordable housing, play space or community facilities as most of the sites gained planning permission before a policy framework to address the need for affordable housing and general planning obligations were put in place.

The main aim of **Option 2: Growth and Regeneration** is to increase the population from 69,300 in 2006 to 71,000 by 2021; this is in accordance with the Wales Spatial Plan (**W34**) aspirations of retaining and attracting residents to the area. This will result in the need to provide 3,000 new homes over the Plan period. As there is a sufficient supply of committed housing sites this will result in the need to identify sites for further 800 houses in the area. From an assessment of the candidate sites it is clear that most of the sites are in the Heads of the Valleys area. This would accord with market demand which tends to focus on the three towns of Tredegar, Ebbw Vale and Brynmawr at each of the Heads of the Valleys.

Option 3: Balanced and Interconnected Communities contains a moderate level of growth and attempts to spread the growth more evenly across the County Borough. This option stabilises the population level at 69,300. This results in the need for 2,355 houses to be provided over the Plan period. This would require the identification of sites for 200 more houses than already have planning permission. These 200 houses would be identified in the Ebbw Fach Valley. As a result, the opportunities for securing affordable homes will be minimal.

The appraisal of the strategic options found option 2 (**SD26**) to be the most sustainable. The Preferred option is envisaged to potentially create a diverse economic base, improving employment opportunities as well as access to a range of services and facilities.

As set out in **SD30** Candidate Site Methodology Paper, stages 4 and 5 of the candidate site assessment process assessed the sites against the Preferred Strategy and the LDP Sustainability Objectives. Appendix 1 summarises the results of this process for all candidate sites.

Have the site selection and policy designation processes been based on appropriate criteria supported by a clear audit trail?

A clear audit trail of the site selection and policy designations processes is set out in:

- **SD32a:** Findings of the Candidate Site Assessment Process
- **SD32b:** Findings of the Candidate Site Assessment Process: Appendix 1: Tredegar Sites
- **SD32c:** Findings of the Candidate Site Assessment Process: Appendix 2: Ebbw Vale Sites
- **SD32d:** Findings of the Candidate Site Assessment Process: Appendix 3: Upper Ebbw Fach Sites
- **SD32e:** Findings of the Candidate Site Assessment Process: Appendix 4: Lower Ebbw Fach Sites

It is considered that the site selection and policy designation process has been based on appropriate criteria and supported by a clear audit trail. This is evidenced by the production of documents **SD32a-e** as listed above. For each site the Council summarises the results of each of the 6 stage assessment process and clearly justifies the reasons why the site should be allocated in the Plan or not. Attached at Appendix 1 is a table which ranks the candidate sites according to the results of stages 4 and 5 of the process.

Rebuttal – HBF (Representor No: 24)

The HBF raised concerns through the deposit consultation on the uncertainty involved in the land supply. Table 5 of **SD44** (page 6) clearly calculates that there is 4.35 years of housing land supply.

The sites allocated in the LDP are viable and deliverable. The owners of a part of the MU1 site have identified through comments on the Plan that they are keen to develop their site in the immediate future and are in pre-application discussions with the Council. This one site would provide sufficient land to meet the 5 year requirement (approximately 200 units). There are also 59 units available from the BKF Plastic Site which wasn't included in the 5 year land supply as the S106 had yet to be signed. Appendix 3 of **SD44** clearly sets out that there is a 5 year supply available.

Rebuttal - DTZ on behalf of Questedge Ltd (Representor No: 41)

DTZ dispute the stage 4 and 5 assessment undertaken for site AS (N) 17. When assessing each of the sites against the Preferred Strategy and Sustainability Objectives (stages 4 and 5 of the candidate site process), a consistent approach was applied and one which followed what had been undertaken as part of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Plan. It is recognised that this is a subjective assessment, however, the Council believe that the assessment was consistently undertaken across all sites being considered for residential development and relied on the results of the expert assessments undertaken for the candidate site process. Therefore, it was clear to the Council that site AS (N) 18 performed less favourably when compared to other residential sites. Appendix 1 sets out the results of all sites assessed at this stage of the process.

2. Are sites H1.1 (Willowtown School), H1.15 (Warm Turn, Six Bells) and H1.20 (Land at Farm Road, Swffryd) appropriate for housing? If not, why not?

Yes. The Council consider that sites H1.1 (Willowtown School), H1.15 (Warm Turn, Six Bells) and H1.20 (Land at Farm Road, Swffryd) are appropriate for Housing.

The allocation of sites for housing followed a robust and methodical assessment process to ensure that every allocated site is capable of development and can contribute to the delivery of the Strategy.

The Candidate Site Methodology Background Paper (**SD30**) sets out the assessment process in full. To summarise each site was subject to:

- **Stage 1:** Initial Planning Assessment undertaken by the Planning Policy Officers
- **Stage 2:** Expert Assessments undertaken by internal officers of the Council
- **Stage 3:** Consultation with appropriate bodies
- **Stage 4:** Assessment of the site against the Preferred Strategy
- **Stage 5:** Assessment of the site against the Local Development Plan (LDP) Sustainability Objectives
- **Stage 6:** Finalisation of sites for the Deposit LDP

H1.1 Willowtown School

This site was previously assessed and approved under the Candidate Site Assessment Process (Candidate Site Reference Number B44). The results of this process are clearly set out in **SD32c**.

To summarise, the site is brownfield land with its former use being a primary school. The site is a vacant development platform with the exception of two buildings, one in the northern corner and another smaller building in the southwest of the site. The larger community building, surrounding wall and retaining walls will be retained where possible.

The site is sustainably located within the existing residential area of Willowtown which is north west of Ebbw Vale town centre. The site is well located in terms of community facilities and is accessible by other modes of transport other than the car. The site is not located in close proximity to an area of international/national importance for biodiversity and is acceptable in terms of flood risk.

The site can be accessed via existing access points and the local highway network is capable of serving this site subject to localised highway improvements being made. The site is also considered acceptable in terms of biodiversity, landscape and environmental health considerations although the candidate site assessment process identified that a full ecological survey including trees and significant vegetation, a biodiversity constraints and

enhancement plan and a preliminary risk assessment would be required at the full planning application stage. A survey requirements table is set out in Appendix 1 **SD10a** and indicates the surveys that should be undertaken and submitted to the Local Planning Authority as part of any future planning application.

Consultation with external bodies during stage 3 of the candidate site assessment process identified that the site was acceptable for further consideration.

The site performed well against the Preferred Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal Objectives when compared to other sites proposed for residential use (Appendix 1).

The site is considered sustainable, developable and compatible with the LDP Strategy and therefore is appropriately allocated for housing in the Deposit LDP.

H1.15 Warm Turn

The site was previously assessed and approved under the Candidate Site Assessment Process (Candidate Site Reference Number D23). The results of this process are clearly set out in **SD32e**.

To summarise, the site is a flat area of vacant brownfield land to the south west of the residential area of Six Bells. The site is south of the upper plateau created for the Six Bells Colliery Site.

The site is sustainably located within the existing residential area of Six Bells. The site is well located in terms of community facilities and is accessible by other modes of transport other than the car. The site is not located in close proximity to an area of international/national importance for biodiversity and is acceptable in terms of flood risk.

The results of the candidate site assessment process identifies that access will only be permitted from Six Bells Road and will therefore need to be considered or developed alongside Six Bells Colliery Site (H1.15).

The site is considered acceptable in terms of landscape and environmental health considerations. In terms of biodiversity the site is acceptable provided that the adjacent SINC and the potential for the site to support protected species is taken into account. It is therefore identified in the survey requirements table (**SD10a**, Appendix 1) that a full ecological survey including trees and significant vegetation, a biodiversity constraints and enhancement plan, a BS5837 Tree Survey, a preliminary risk assessment and noise assessment be required at the full planning application stage.

Consultation with external bodies during stage 3 of the candidate site assessment process identified that the site was acceptable for further consideration.

In the final stage of the candidate site assessment process the site performed well against the Preferred Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal Objectives when compared to other sites proposed for residential use (Appendix 1).

The site is considered sustainable, developable and compatible with the LDP Strategy and therefore is appropriately allocated for housing in the Deposit LDP.

H1.20 Land at Farm Road, Swffryd

The site was previously assessed and approved under the Candidate Site Assessment Process (Candidate Site Reference Number D24). The results of this process are clearly set out in **SD32e**.

The site occupies an elevated location east of the settlement of Swffryd. The land is greenfield with part of the site formally used as a playing pitch. To east of the site are residential properties and the remainder of the site is surrounded by open space.

The site is well related to the existing settlement of Swffryd. The site is well located in terms of community facilities and is accessible by other modes of transport other than the car. The site is not located in close proximity to an area of international/national importance for biodiversity and is acceptable in terms of flood risk.

The results of the candidate site assessment process identifies that access will only be permitted via Gordon Avenue subject to local highway improvements. Secondary vehicular access will also be required via Farm Road. A transport assessment is required at the full planning application stage (**SD10a**, Appendix 1).

It is acknowledged that the site is known to support species and habitats, part of the site is within a SINC designation and there are visual impact concerns. It is therefore identified that a full ecological survey including trees and significant vegetation, a biodiversity constraints and enhancement plan and a visual impact assessment would be required at the full planning application stage (**SD10a**, Appendix 1).

As a result of representations received to this site, the Site Descriptions document (**SD34**) which has been prepared to provide more detail on the allocated land has been updated to reflect that the detailed design of the development and provision of open space is critical to this site and the landscape quality of the site.

In the final stage of the candidate site assessment process the site performed well against the Preferred Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal Objectives when compared to other sites proposed for residential use.

As reflected in **SD32e**, a larger parcel of land was assessed which was based on the Unitary Development Plan allocation (**SD127a**). The assessment process revealed that it was not considered appropriate to allocate the whole of the site boundary but more sustainable, developable and compatible with the LDP Strategy to allocate part of the site.

Rebuttals to the Examination Statements received to the housing allocations are included at Appendix 2.

3. What is the logic for deleting site allocations H1.4 (Jesmondene Stadium, Cefn Golau) and H1.5 (Business Resource Centre, Tafarnaubach)?
--

H1.4 Jesmondene Stadium

In response to the Deposit Plan consultation, 5 representations were received to the allocation of Jesmondene Stadium for housing. Of the 5 representations received, 4 were objections which included two petitions (one with 19 names and the second with 3 names) and 1 supported the allocation.

3 of the objections received sought the deletion of the site and the other sought an amendment to the boundary of the allocation to exclude the area outside of the stadium. These were therefore advertised during the alternative site consultation, one as an amendment AS(A)07 and the second as a deleted site AS(D)02 (**SD33a**). At this stage one comment was received to each objecting to the deletion of the site and proposed amendment.

A number of issues were raised at the Deposit Plan consultation stage as to why the site was not suitable for housing. The Council has responded to each of these in **SD07b** (pages 167 - 174).

Two significant issues in relation to land instability and land contamination were identified at the Deposit Plan consultation stage which in the Council's and local members view are unresolved issues that raise questions of the site's viability and deliverability.

Land Instability

The Local Authority is currently investigating potential slope stability issues between Marion Close and the stadium (within the site boundary) following modification works to the tip which were undertaken without planning consent. Once the investigation is concluded the Authority will issue a statement on the slope stability dependent upon the findings of the investigation.

Land Contamination

Part of the site is used as a scrap yard. The Environment Agency have confirmed that the landowner has not been operating the scrap yard in compliance with the permit and has been storing 900 – 1,000 vehicles on

grass rather than concrete, therefore resulting in potential for land contamination. As a result of this illegal activity on the site, the landowner has been instructed to clear the land.

The Environment Agency Wales confirmed that the site has not been tested in terms of land contamination, however due to non compliance of the permit there is potential for contamination at this site.

H1.5 Business Resource Centre, Tafarnaubach

In response to the Deposit Plan consultation, an objection was received to the allocation of the Business Resource Centre for housing. The objection sought the deletion of the site from the Plan. The deletion of this site was then advertised as an alternative site AS(D)03 (**SD33a**).

At this stage, 23 representations were received, all of which supported the deletion of the site from the Plan.

A number of issues were raised during the deposit plan consultation and through local members as to why the site was not suitable for housing. The Council has responded to each of these issues in **SD07b** (pages 175-183).

In addition to this, since the Deposit Plan was issued for consultation, there have been circumstantial changes relating to the allocation of this site for housing.

The site is currently occupied by a training centre and offices for the Council's regeneration division and is located on a primary industrial estate - Tafarnaubach Industrial Estate. There are long term plans to relocate the training centre hence the consideration of the site for housing development. At present no formal decision has been taken in terms of the relocation of the training facility. As the training facility forms an important aspect of the employment strategy for Blaenau Gwent it is considered that the site should be retained for this use.

In addition to this, the recently announced Enterprise Zone should provide employment opportunities and boost the local economy. Therefore, in the event that the training facility is relocated from this site then the land would still be required for employment use. Therefore the site should be retained for employment use.

A further issue identified in the representations received was regarding the loss of character of Tafarnaubach village. The site is currently located on an established industrial estate. The site is bordered to the north and east by the main access road into the industrial estate and to the south by new residential properties. The integration of housing and industry could lead to more sustainable lifestyles but design and location are important issues. There is a danger that the exponential growth of Tafarnaubach and Princetown villages could destroy any sense of community and result in a loss of character.

The Council consider that the site is inappropriate as a housing allocation and should be deleted from the Plan as reflected in **SD10a**, page 5, FC1.L).

It is also worth noting that the results of the Deposit Plan and Alternative Site consultation were reported to local members in November 2011 through a series of workshop meetings. The local members raised concerns regarding the development of Jesmondene Stadium and the Business Resource Centre. Copies of the minutes of these meetings are attached at Appendix 3.

Rebuttals to the Examination Statements received to the housing allocations are included at Appendix 2.

4. Is there a need to identify any additional or alternative sites for housing and/or live-work activity? Are the alternative proposals put forward by other representers (for example, AS(N)17 – land at Tanglewood, Blaina; AS(N)18 – Ffoesmaen Road; and AS(N) 21 – Ty Pwdr) appropriate and deliverable? Have these sites been subject to sustainability appraisal compatible with that for the allocated sites in the Plan?

Is there a need to identify any additional or alternative sites for housing?

No. The Council consider that there is no need to identify any additional or alternative sites for housing and/or live-work activity.

The Inspector's attention is directed to **SD40** Housing Background Paper and **SD41** Updated Housing Background Paper which sets out the housing land requirement figures. The Inspector's attention is also directed to the Council's Examination Statement for Hearing Session 2: Housing (**ES2.5**).

The allocation of sites for housing followed a robust and methodical assessment process to ensure that every allocated site is capable of development and can contribute to the delivery of the Strategy. The Inspector's attention is directed to **SD30**: Candidate Site Methodology Background Paper which sets out the assessment process in full and **SD32a-f**: Findings of the Candidate Site Assessment Process.

The promotion of live-work activity in the countryside is not considered a major issue worthy of inclusion in the Plan as Blaenau Gwent is not a rural area (**ES9.1**). However, the consideration of live-work units in the urban area will be dealt with through development management policies.

Notwithstanding this, it is considered that criterion (e) of policy SP8 Sustainable Economic Growth will serve to support the promotion of rural enterprise which includes such development as live-work units.

Are the alternative proposals put forward by other representers (for example, AS(N)17 – land at Tanglewood, Blaina; AS(N)18 –

Ffoesmaen Road; and AS(N) 21 – Ty Pwdr) appropriate and deliverable?

No. The Council consider that the alternative proposals put forward by other representors are not appropriate and deliverable.

AS (N) 17 - Land at Tanglewood, Blaina

The site was previously assessed and rejected under the Candidate Site Assessment Process (Candidate Site Number C5). The results of this process is clearly set out in **SD32d**. The site was considered to be unsuitable for residential development on the grounds of visual impact; and development of the site would result in loss of open space, habitat and fragmentation of the ecological complex.

It is acknowledged that the development of this site would be an extension to the Tanglewood residential development. However, as concluded in the candidate site assessment process the visual impacts are significant at present, developing this site would make the visual impact worse.

The site is greenfield land of high biodiversity value and if developed for housing would impact on the quality and character of the landscape.

The site is located in the Northern Strategy Area. The deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to deliver sustainable growth and regeneration in this area through favouring the reuse of previously developed land within existing settlements. This site would therefore not support the delivery of the LDP. Attached at Appendix 1 are the results of the assessment of the sites against the Preferred Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.

AS(N)18 – Ffoesmaen Road

The site was previously assessed and rejected under the candidate site assessment process (Candidate Site C11). The site was considered to be unsuitable for residential development on the grounds that the site is greenfield land of high biodiversity and landscape value.

However, the incorrect site boundary was submitted to the Council at the candidate site assessment stage therefore the representor has undertaken its own assessment of the site following the process in **SD30** and an independent ecological assessment.

The Council have reviewed the assessments undertaken and reassessed the site. It remains the Council's view that the site is unsuitable for residential development on the grounds that the site is of biodiversity and landscape value.

Based on the ecological information available, the site supports a habitat mosaic with predominantly acid grassland and supports at least 8 species listed in the SINC criteria and therefore it is considered that the site qualifies

as a SINC (**SD113**). A full Council response to the independent ecological assessment is set out in **SD07b** (pages 444-447).

The site is also of landscape value in that the site falls within Mulfran Special Landscape Area and is distinctive as pasture land that falls between settlement and upland heath. It is also considered that large scale development as proposed will have a high visual impact due to the elevated nature of the site beyond the clearly defined settlement boundary.

The site is located in the Northern Strategy Area. The deposit LDP allocates sufficient land to deliver sustainable growth and regeneration in this area through the favouring the reuse of previously developed land within existing settlements. This site would therefore not support the delivery of the LDP. Attached at Appendix 1 are the results of the assessment of the sites against the Preferred Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.

Rebuttals to the Examination Statements received to the alternative sites are included at Appendix 2.

AS (N) 21 – Ty Pwdr

The response to this site is set out in **ES19.2**.

Have these sites been subject to sustainability appraisal compatible with that for the allocated sites in the Plan?

The Council note that the representors of alternative sites AS(N)17 - Land at Tanglewood, Blaina, AS(N)18 - Ffoesmaen Road and AS(N)19 – Ty Pwdr have undertaken sustainability appraisal of the sites.

However, the Council would not agree that the sustainability appraisals are compatible with that for the allocated sites in the Plan. The Council note this is a very subjective assessment but do not consider that the representors have made realistic assumptions when assessing the sites. The Council's assessments are based on the views received from the expert assessments, the representors' assessments fail to acknowledge biodiversity and landscape issues that are clearly known constraints for these sites.

The Council has undertaken its own sustainability appraisal of the alternative sites which is comparable to that done for the allocated sites. The results of which are included as an appendix to this statement. It should be drawn to the Inspectors attention that when comparing the alternative sites, the sites performed are less sustainable than the allocated sites.

Appendix 1

Ebbw Vale Area

Ref No.	Name	LDP Objectives	SEA/SA	Total	Contribution
Proposed sites for LDP Deposit Plan					
B44	Willowtown School	20	57	77	22
B5, B7, B8, B46	Ebbw Vale North (Mixed Use allocation)	40	32	72	700
				Total	722
B21	Waunlwyd School	16	49	65	12
AS (N) 04	Land at Big Lane – Site 6	18	42	60	
B20	Highlands Road	14	39	53	60
AS (N) 02	Land at Big Lane – Site 4	14	39	53	
AS (N) 03	Land at Bryn Farm – Site 5	14	33	47	
AS (N) 05	Land off Parkhill Crescent	16	31	47	
B16	Lakeside Car Park, Festival Park	11	29	40	14
B19	Vacant site adj Respite Care Centre	12	27	39	10
B24	Land adj to the Castle, Rassau	10	25	35	12
B35 AS (N) 01	Nant-y-Croft, Rassau	10	21	31	51
Sites taken out at Stage 2 assessment					
B1	Adjacent to Wrekin Site, Aberbeeg				
B9	Land at Bryn y Gwynt				
B10	Drysiog Farm				
B11	Land off Parkhill Crescent				
B12	Land off Pant-y-Fforest				
B15	Land surrounding Wetlands Building, Festival Park				
B18	Cwm Slopes, Festival Park				
B23	Land at Park View, Beaufort				
B24	Land adj to the Castle, Rassau				
B41	Land to the rear of Glyndwr Road, Rassau				

This table identifies the best performing housing sites in the Ebbw Vale Area.

The site in yellow performed well against the assessment but has issues with it which means that it should not be taken forward.

B21 - Waunlwyd School: On reflection this should be classed as a small site as realistically it can only accommodate 6-8 houses due to the shape of the site and the need to retain the boundary walls.

Tredegar

Ref No.	Site Name	LDP Objectives	SEA/SA	Total	Contribution
Proposed Sites for LDP Deposit Plan					
A21	Corporation Yard	20	57	77	12
A45	Jesmondene Stadium	20	53	73	179
A25	Cartref Aneurin Bevan	20	51	71	13
A26	Greenacres	20	51	71	18
A43	Business Resource Centre	18	51	69	42
A19	Waundeg Housing Site	16	53	69	30
				Total	294
A22	Land at Sirhowy	16	49	65	30
A4	Former Gas Holder Station	16	49	65	17
A23	Land adjacent to Bryn Rhosyn	16	49	65	24
A11	Tredegar Ambulance Station	16	47	63	17
A28	Land at rear of Cripps Avenue	14	45	59	30
A12	North Side of Merthyr Rd	14	41	55	21
A13	Land to the North of Bryn Rhosyn	14	39	53	17
A46	Land South of Bevans Avenue	16	33	49	69
A36	Adj Chartist Way	13	35	48	101
A47	Park Hill	13	32	45	378
Sites taken out at stage 2 assessment					
A5	Northern boundary to Bryn Pica				
A6	Land opposite Hunts Lodge				
A7	Rear of Factories and Pochin House				
A10	The Rhyd, Peacehaven				
A16	Tyr Morgan Hywel Farm, Nantybwich				
A24	Land at Golwg-y-Mynydd				
A27	Mile End Field, Georgetown				
A41	Land adjacent to Dukestown Cemetery				
A44	Fairview Field, Nantybwich				

The table above identifies the best performing housing sites in the Tredegar Area. The sites in yellow performed well against the assessment but have issues which mean they are not being taken forward. The sites in orange have been taken forward into the LDP but may not be allocated at the higher density figure or may now be listed as a housing commitment rather than an allocation.

A21 – Corporation Yard: This site now has planning permission and so is allocated as a housing commitment in the LDP.

A45 – Jesmondene Stadium: Part of the site, the brownfield area of land has been allocated for housing only.

A19 – Waundeg Housing Site: This site is subject to stock transfer and therefore there is uncertainty as to what will happen with the site.

A22 – Land at Sirhowy: There are instability problems and mine shafts that make the site unviable.

A4 – Former Gas Holder Station: Although it was agreed that this was a good site, it does have contamination issues and has not come forward in a good economic climate it is considered appropriate for the site to be not taken forward.

A23 – Land adjacent to Bryn Rhosyn: There are ground instability problems with this site that makes the site unviable.

A11 – Tredegar Ambulance Station: There is uncertainty as to whether the ambulance service will be closing this building – at present cannot confirm either way.

A28 – Land at Cripps Avenue: This site is subject to stock transfer and therefore there is uncertainty as to what will happen with the site.

A12 – North side of Merthyr Road: outline planning permission pending

A13 – Land to the North of Bryn Rhosyn: There are ground instability problems with this site

A46 - Land South of Bevans Avenue: It is difficult to envisage how access can be achieved at this site. There are 2 possible means of access to the site – Ashvale Football Club and the end of the cul-de-sac of Bevan Avenue. Ashvale Football Club – applicant has not indicated who owns or controls the land to gain access to the site.

The end of the cul-de-sac of Bevan Avenue – given the existing cul de sac length of Bevans Avenue is already in excess of the design maximum permitted vehicular access would not be permitted to serve as access to any development proposal.

A36 - Adj Chartist Way: The contribution figure is likely to be lower due to constraints.

A47 –Park Hill: The site has planning permission

Upper Ebbw Fach Area

Ref No.	Name	LDP Objectives	SEA/SA	Total	Contribution
Proposed sites for LDP Deposit Plan					
C6	Garnfach School (based on mixed use allocation)	23	57	80	12
C22 & C32	NMC Factory Blaina Road (Mixed use allocation)	29	49	78	60
C25	Brynmawr Infants School & Old Griffin yard	20	57	77	37
C8	Hafod Dawel Site	20	57	54	44
C23	Crawshay House	20	53	73	25
C26	Land at Pant View, Coed Cae	20	53	73	26
C39	Land to the east of Blaina Road	19	53	72	21
C12	Land to the North of Winchestown	20	49	69	15
			Total		240
C14	Land West of Recreation Ground	20	45	65	16
C24	Land rear of Waunheulog	16	43	59	42
C15 AS (N) 20	Land North of Winches Row	14	41	55	110
AS (N) 18	Ffoesmaen Road	14	41	55	
AS (N) 14	Land at Beaufort Hill – Site 2	14	39	53	
AS (N) 16	Land east of Pant View Houses, Coed Cae	14	35	49	
AS (N) 13	Land at Brynmawr – Site 1	14	33	47	
AS (N) 15	Land at Bryn Farm – Site 3	14	29	43	
C3	Land to the south of Rising Sun Industrial Estate	10	33	43	81
C13 AS (N) 19	Land to the South-West of Waun Ebbw Road	14	35	49	50
C5 AS (N) 17	Southlands, Blaina	10	25	35	52

Sites taken out at stage 2 assessment	
C1	Land at Upper Coed Cae, Nantyglo
C2	Land east of Pant View Houses, Coed Cae
C4	Croesyceiliog Farm
C9	Land adjacent to Gwaelodd-y-Gelli
C10	Former Bus Depot, Land west of A467, Blaina
C11	Ffoesmaen Road, Upper Coed Cae
C31	Land adjacent to Station Terrace, Nantyglo
C36	BEWA (UK) Ltd, Noble Square Industrial Estate
C37	Land at Twyn Blaenant, Blaenavon Road, Brynmawr
C38	Brynewelon, Nantyglo

The table above identifies the best performing housing sites in the Upper Ebbw Fach Area. The site in yellow performed well against the assessment but has issues which mean it is not being taken forward.

C26 – Land at Pant View, Coed Cae: This site is subject to stock transfer and therefore there is uncertainty as to what will happen with the site.

Lower Ebbw Fach Area

Ref No.	Name	LDP Objectives	SEA/SA	Total	Contribution
Proposed Sites for Deposit LDP					
D13a	Six Bells Colliery Site	23	49	72	60
D23	Warm Turn	16	49	65	32
D25	Roseheyworth Comprehensive	16	45	61	33
D21	Former Mount Pleasant Court, Brynithel	16	45	61	18
D30	Quarry Adj to Cwm Farm Road	16	45	61	22
			Total		165
D20	Hillcrest View	16	41	57	22
AS (N) 21	Ty Pwdr	8	39	47	
Sites taken out at stage 2 assessment					
D1	Ty Dan-y-Wal Road, West Bank, Cwmtillery				
D2	Former NCB Housing, Hafod-y-Coed				
D6	Land to the west of Lewis Street, Swffryd				
D7	South of Lewis Street, Swffryd				
D8	Argoed Farm, Aberbeeg				
D9	Quarry at the Gilfach Wen Farm, Six Bells				
D16	Brynhydrid Junior School				
D17	Former Tyr Graig Junior Mixed & Infants School				
D24	Rear of Farm Road				
D26	Greenmeadow Farm (UDP Allocation H2 (10))				
D27	Ty Pwdr / Greenmeadow Farm (UDP Allocation H2 (35))				
D29	Land to the east of Bournville Road, Blaina				

The table above identifies the best performing housing sites in Lower Ebbw Fach. The site highlighted in orange has been taken forward into the LDP because planning permission has been granted.

D20 – Hillcrest View: Planning permission has been granted.

Appendix 2

Rebuttal of Housing Allocations

Summary of Representer's Case	Council Response
H1.1 Willowtown School	
<p>Representer: Unite the Union (60)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No demand or requirement for housing in the area • Increase in traffic problems in the area due to the entrance and exit of the new Willowtown school • The site should be developed for a car park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The justification for the housing requirement figures is clearly set out in the Updated Housing Background Paper (SD41) and the examination statement for hearing session 2: housing (ES2.5). • The Highway Authority has completed both a site inspection and a Highway Assessment Proforma for this LDP allocation. It is the opinion of the Highway Authority that the local highway network is capable of serving the site subject to localised highway improvements. In addition a Traffic Impact Assessment, which would need to be submitted with any planning application, should identify any further highway improvements. These improvements would need to be addressed to the satisfaction of the highway authority for any formal planning application to be recommended for planning approval. • The housing allocation is considered developable, sustainable and compatible with the LDP Strategy as identified in the candidate site assessment process. It would be unfeasible to provide car parking on the whole of the site, however part of the site could be used for car parking. This will be considered during the preparation of the detailed plans for the site.
H1.4 Jesmondene Stadium	
<p>Representer: Mr B Brooks (42)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three separate geologists cannot find any land instabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In November 2011, the Council commissioned Capita Symonds to undertake an assessment into the stability of recent earthworks at Jesmondene Stadium (ES4.1). The conclusions of the report reveal that there are land instabilities issues on the land and summarised below: <i>"The hummocky nature of the lower slopes suggest that they may not have been formed by benching and compaction to formal engineering</i>

	<p><i>requirements"</i> <i>"Stability analysis undertaken by Dr Noake suggest that the new earthworks profile are stable...however there is an error in the factors of safety quoted for the upper slopes...this means that the upper slopes do not comply with the long term factor of safety of 1.3".</i> <i>"G.A. Spacey and Associates state in the conclusions to their report that the earthworks carried out on the site appear to be in an unstable condition, particularly the lower slope. They also recommend that appropriate works are undertaken to remediate the slope, involving regrading, recompaction and drainage measures".</i></p>
<p>H1.14 Warm Turn</p>	
<p>Representor: Mr A Thomas (83)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions the population figures and housing need • Raises concern over the housing development and its impact on Warm Turn A467 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council have responded to this issue in SD07b (page 21) • The Highway Authority confirm that the said route is not operating at its capacity, and any proposed development served off this primary route will have junction/highway infrastructure and improvements that will be designed in accordance with current safety standards and capacity specification for such a residential development. The extent of such junction design/infrastructure works cannot be determined until proposed traffic flow/movement patterns have been analysed. Any such development will be the subject of a Traffic Impact Assessment and have the required Independent Road Safety Audit undertaken. The Highway Authority confirms that there are no objections to residential development at this location.

Rebuttal of Alternative Sites

Summary of Representer's Case	Council Response
AS (N) 17	
<p>Representer: DTZ for Questedge Ltd (41)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questedge do not agree that the local authority has undertaken a sound review of the potential conformity of the site for potential allocation • No significant biodiversity value was identified as a result of the ecology appraisal and the site was considered acceptable by the Authority in terms of biodiversity • The Landscape and Visual Impact report does not find the potential impact to be damaging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When assessing each of the sites against the Preferred Strategy and Sustainability Objectives (stages 4 and 5 of the candidate site process), a consistent approach was applied and one which followed what had been undertaken as part of consultants employed to undertake the Sustainability Appraisal for the Plan. It is recognised that this is a subjective assessment, however, the Council believe that the assessment was consistently undertaken across all sites being considered for residential development and relied on the results of the expert assessments undertaken for the candidate site process. Therefore, it was clear to the Council that site AS (N) 18 performed less favourably when compared to other residential sites. Appendix 1 sets out the results of all sites assessed at this stage of the process. • The Council disagree and consider that the site is unacceptable in terms of biodiversity (SD32d). It remains the Council's view that the site would result in the loss of open space, habitat and fragmentation of the ecological complex. • It remains the Council's view that the visual impacts are significant at present, developing this site would make the visual impact unacceptable.
AS (N) 18	
<p>Representer: Mr W Cooksey (42)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site satisfied stage 1 : the Initial Planning Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council agree that the stage 1 assessment concluded that the site is well related to the existing settlement, is accessible by all modes of transport, is well located in terms of community facilities and is acceptable in terms of flood risk. However, the Council assessed the biodiversity of the site in terms of its international

Summary of Representer's Case	Council Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's ecology report is flawed • The site is not of sufficient importance to be designated as a SLA • Assessment stages 4, 5 & 6 were not completed by BGCBC • The representer seeks confirmation on whether a full ecological survey and assessment has been undertaken. • The representer seeks an 	<p>and national importance and was found to be acceptable in this regard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council disagree. The ecology report undertaken for this site was completed as part of the candidate site assessment process by a professional ecologist. It is noted that an independent report was prepared by the representer. A full response to this independent ecology report has been undertaken by another of the Council's ecologist who has in fact concluded from the independent ecology report that the site supports a mosaic of habitats of SINC quality - development of this site would result in the fragmentation of these habitats as well as further disturbance on the site and adjacent SINC. • Designation of Blaenau Gwent Special Landscape Areas was based on a robust and rigorous exercise carried out by Bronwen Thomas (SD110) to an agreed methodology based on the Landmap assessment for the area. The use of LANDMAP is recognised as an important information source (W41, page 72, paragraph 5.3.13). The evaluation grades that have been designated in landscape value on Land Map are moderate to high value in terms of three aspects: Earth Science; History and Archaeology; and Culture. • The Council have completed assessment stages 4, 5 and 6. The results of the assessments for each candidate and alternative site are attached at Appendix 1. The issue of the difference of the results produced by the representer and the Council is explained under question 4 of ES4.9. • The Council can confirm that aside from the Biodiversity assessment work completed as part of the candidate site process, an ecological survey has not been undertaken on the site. A survey of this nature would be required at the full planning application stage and would be required to be undertaken by the developer of the site. • Every allocation made in the LDP has

Summary of Representer's Case	Council Response
<p>explanation as to why sites have been allocated for housing in the LDP apart from being located in the urban boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corrugated tin holdings sheds and concrete manure platform reported as historical importance in the Countryside and Landscape form. • Lack of new housing in Nantyglo • Housing needs will be higher than anticipated despite past population trends • The representer questions whether the selection process has been based on an appropriate criteria and supported by a clear audit trail with substantive and independent reports 	<p>been subject to a robust and methodical candidate site assessment process to ensure that the site is developable, sustainable and compatible with the LDP strategy (SD30). The Council has produced a series of documents (SD32a-e) which clearly set out the reasons why sites have not been allocated and others have. Appendix 1 also evidences the results of the assessment of the sites against the Preferred Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal Objectives which shows that the site performs less favourable when compared to other sites allocated for housing in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree. The Countryside and Landscape Form identifies that there is site of historical importance located within 100m. Attached at Appendix 4 is a Plan which shows the GIS overlay which identifies the site of historical importance as being a post medieval type building in good condition. The origin of this data is from the Glamorgan- Gwent Archaeological Trust who are a statutory consultee. • The Council disagree. The Plan allocates land for 3 housing developments in the Nantyglo ward (H1.7, H1.10, H1.11 and H1.13) which make provision for 102 dwellings (SD01, page 87). The allocations H1.10 and H1.7 are located in close proximity to AS(N)18. In addition to this, there is planning permission for 64 small units on small sites in and around Nantyglo. • The justification for the housing requirement figures is clearly set out in the Updated Housing Background Paper (SD41) and the examination statement for hearing session 2: housing (ES2.5). • The Council consider that the selection process has been based on appropriate criteria and supported by a clear audit trail with substantive and independent reports. The Council's full response to this question is set out in ES4.9.

APPENDIX 3

Minutes of Local Development Plan Meetings

**Local Development Plan Member Meeting
Ebbw Vale Area
2.00pm Thursday 27th October 2011
Executive Room, Civic Centre, Ebbw Vale**

Attendees present

Cllr D. Wilcox
Cllr M.J. Lewis
Cllr J.T. Rogers
Cllr W.J. Williams M.B.E., J.P.
Cllr G.J. Hughes
Cllr C. Meredith
Cllr J. Morgan, J.P.
Cllr D. Wilkshire
Cllr B. Clements

Lynda Healy – Development Plans Manager
Hayley Spender – Planning Policy Officer
Ged McHugh – Head of Economic Development
Steve Smith – Head of Planning and Building Control

The Executive Member – Regeneration and Highways welcomed the Members and Officers to the meeting which had been convened to:

- Outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan and on the 'Alternative Sites'
- Enable Members to voice concerns regarding the issues raised
- Explain the next steps

The Development Plans Manager gave a presentation, with the aid of slides (a copy of which was provided for Members) to provide an update on where we are in the LDP process, identify the main issues arising from the deposit plan consultation and outline proposed focussed changes to policies.

The Development Plans Manager and the Planning Policy Officer then gave a further presentation, with the aid of slides to outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan allocations and on the 'Alternative Sites'. This enabled Members to voice concerns regarding the comments raised.

The Members approved every Officer Recommendation in relation to the allocations and alternative sites.

**Local Development Plan Member Meeting
Upper Ebbw Fach Area
9.30am Tuesday 8th November 2011
Executive Room, Civic Centre, Ebbw Vale**

Attendees present

Cllr S Ford
Cllr J E Mason
Cllr G Collier
Cllr Y Lewis

Lynda Healy – Development Plans Manager
Hayley Spender – Planning Policy Officer
Brian Swain – Planning Policy Officer
Eirlys Hallett– Head of Planning Control

Apologies

Cllr D. Wilcox
Cllr K J Brown
Cllr D L Elias
Cllr J J Hopkins, Dip.Ed., Dip.,Dip. Sc., O.St.J

The Development Plans Manager welcomed the Members and Officers to the meeting which had been convened to:

- Outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan and on the 'Alternative Sites'
- Enable Members to voice concerns regarding the issues raised
- Explain the next steps

The Development Plans Manager gave a presentation, with the aid of slides (a copy of which was provided for Members) to provide an update on where we are in the LDP process, identify the main issues arising from the deposit plan consultation and outline proposed focussed changes to policies.

The Development Plans Manager and the Planning Policy Officer then gave a further presentation, with the aid of slides to outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan allocations and on the 'Alternative Sites'. This enabled Members to voice concerns regarding the comments raised.

The Members approved every Officer Recommendation in relation to the allocations and alternative sites but made the following comments with regard to particular sites:

Nantyglo Ward

H1.7 Garnfach School site

Cllr S Ford and Cllr J E Mason questioned why the site was not also allocated for a community use. The Development Plans Manager explained that at the time of preparing the Plan there was a significant amount of uncertainty around what community use was to be developed on the site. However the

Site Descriptions document which is a supporting document to the Plan does explain that part of the site is required for a community scheme.

Recommendation

No change to the Officer Recommendation.

Brynmawr Ward

H1.8 Crawshay House

Cllr JE Mason agreed that there is a lack of accommodation in Blaenau Gwent. He questioned if enquiries had been made with the private sector to determine the level of interest in locating a hotel at this site. The Development Plans Manager advised that this had not been undertaken but it is something that the team would look into.

Recommendation

This has now been investigated and from the information gathered it appears that this would not be the type of site that developers are looking for. It should be noted however that this form of development is encouraged by policies within the Plan.

No Change to Officer Recommendation (retain as housing site)

It was suggested that the information given out during the meeting be circulated to the Members not present.

Local Development Plan Member Meeting
Tredegar Area
11.00 am Tuesday 8th November 2011
Executive Room, Civic Centre, Ebbw Vale

Attendees present

Cllr K Hayden
Cllr A Hobbs
Cllr S Thomas
Cllr H L Trollope
Cllr B G Willis
Cllr B Thomas

Lynda Healy – Development Plans Manager
Hayley Spender – Planning Policy Officer
Brian Swain – Planning Policy Officer
Eirlys Hallett– Head of Planning Control

Apologies

Cllr D. Wilcox
Cllr D J Owens
Cllr D Rowberry

The Development Plans Manager welcomed the Members and Officers to the meeting which had been convened to:

- Outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan and on the 'Alternative Sites'
- Enable Members to voice concerns regarding the issues raised
- Explain the next steps

The Development Plans Manager gave a presentation, with the aid of slides (a copy of which was provided for Members) to provide an update on where we are in the LDP process, identify the main issues arising from the deposit plan consultation and outline proposed focussed changes to policies.

The Development Plans Manager and the Planning Policy Officer then gave a further presentation, with the aid of slides to outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan allocations and on the 'Alternative Sites'. This enabled Members to voice concerns regarding the comments raised.

The Members approved every Officer Recommendation in relation to the allocations and alternative sites but made the following comments with regard to particular sites:

Tredegar Central & West

H1.4 Jesmondene Stadium

Cllr H L Trollope strongly objected to the allocation of this site in the Plan on the grounds of land stability as the site is made of shale tip. He also raised

concerns regarding access and flooding of the land in front of the site (Marion Close).

Recommendation

Agreed to change the Officer Recommendation to delete the site from the Plan.

Sirhowy Ward

H1.5 Business Resource Centre

Cllr B Thomas objected to the allocation of this site in the Plan. The development of this site for housing would result in the loss of employment land and would not be in keeping with the character of the area. If the existing Business Resource Centre were to be demolished then it would be more appropriate to locate another factory unit on the site.

Recommendation

Agreed to change the Officer Recommendation to delete the site from the Plan.

AS (N) 07 – Access Road at Tafarnaubach Industrial Estate

All Tredegar Members supported the proposal and are actively looking for funding to implement the scheme.

Recommendation

No change to the Officer Recommendation though consideration should be given to identifying a scheme and funding to enable it to be included through the first revision to the Plan.

Other issues raised, relating to car parking and access through the Business Park will be dealt with through the appropriate channels.

**Local Development Plan Member Meeting
Lower Ebbw Fach Area
12.3 0pm Wednesday 9th November 2011
Executive Room, Civic Centre, Ebbw Vale**

Attendees present

Cllr H McCarthy

Lynda Healy – Development Plans Manager

Hayley Spender – Planning Policy Officer

Steve Smith – Head of Planning and Building Control

The Development Plans Manager welcomed the Member and Officers to the meeting which had been convened to:

- Outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan and on the 'Alternative Sites'
- Enable Members to voice concerns regarding the issues raised
- Explain the next steps

The Development Plans Manager gave a presentation, with the aid of slides (a copy of which was provided for Members) to provide an update on where we are in the LDP process, identify the main issues arising from the deposit plan consultation and outline proposed focussed changes to policies.

The Development Plans Manager and the Planning Policy Officer then gave a further presentation, with the aid of slides to outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan allocations and on the 'Alternative Sites'. This enabled Members to voice concerns regarding the comments raised.

The Members approved every Officer Recommendation in relation to the allocations and alternative sites.

**Local Development Plan Member Meeting
Drop in Session
9.30am – 12.30pm Friday 18th November 2011
Executive Room, Civic Centre, Ebbw Vale**

Ebbw Vale Session 9.30am – 10.00am

No Members attended

Lynda Healy – Development Plans Manager
Hayley Spender – Planning Policy Officer

Tredegar Session 10.00am – 10.30am

No Members attended

Lynda Healy – Development Plans Manager
Hayley Spender – Planning Policy Officer

Upper Ebbw Fach Session 10.30am – 11.30am

Attendees present

Cllr M B Dally
Cllr D L Elias

Lynda Healy – Development Plans Manager
Hayley Spender – Planning Policy Officer

Apologies

Cllr J J Hopkins, Dip.Ed., Dip.,Dip. Sc., O.St.J

The Development Plans Manager welcomed the Members and Officers to the meeting which had been convened to:

- Outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan and on the 'Alternative Sites'
- Enable Members to voice concerns regarding the issues raised
- Explain the next steps

The Development Plans Manager gave a presentation, with the aid of slides (a copy of which was provided for Members) to provide an update on where we are in the LDP process, identify the main issues arising from the deposit plan consultation and outline proposed focussed changes to policies.

The Development Plans Manager and the Planning Policy Officer then gave a further presentation, with the aid of slides to outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan allocations and on the 'Alternative Sites'. This enabled Members to voice concerns regarding the comments raised.

The Members approved every Officer Recommendation in relation to the allocations and alternative sites but made the following comments with regard to particular sites:

Nantyglo Ward

H1.7 Garnfach School site

Cllr M B Dally questioned why the site was not also allocated for a community use. The Development Plans Manager explained that at the time of preparing the Plan there was a significant amount of uncertainty around what community use was to be developed on the site. However the Site Descriptions document which is a supporting document to the Plan does explain that part of the site is required for a community scheme.

Recommendation

No change to the Officer Recommendation.

Brynmawr Ward

Cllr D L Elias proposed that an additional highway improvement should be included in the Plan. A one way system from Clydach Street through to Intermediate Road should be developed. The Development Plans Manager explained that for any allocation of this nature to be included in the Plan deliverability and viability needed to be demonstrated i.e. funding has been identified for the improvement and a scheme needs to be designed. It was agreed that as this improvement was not at that stage, no allocation would be made. However the allocation could be considered for inclusion at the first review of the Plan.

No change to the Officer Recommendation though consideration should be given to identifying a scheme and funding to enable it to be included through the first revision to the Plan.

Lower Ebbw Fach Session 11.30am – 12.30pm

Attendees Present

Cllr D Davies

Cllr D Hancock

Cllr WC Watkins

Lynda Healy – Development Plans Manager

Hayley Spender – Planning Policy Officer

The Development Plans Manager welcomed the Members and Officers to the meeting which had been convened to:

- Outline the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan and on the 'Alternative Sites'
- Enable Members to voice concerns regarding the issues raised
- Explain the next steps

The Development Plans Manager provided an update on where we are in the LDP process, identified the main issues arising from the deposit plan consultation and outlined proposed focussed changes to policies.

The Development Plans Manager and the Planning Policy Officer outlined the representations made on the Deposit Local Development Plan allocations and on the 'Alternative Sites'. This enabled Members to voice concerns regarding the comments raised.

The Members approved every Officer Recommendation in relation to the allocations and alternative sites. In particular, Cllr D Davies strongly supported the officer recommendation to not allocate land at Ty Pwdr (AS (N) 21) for housing.

Appendix 4

AVG001\NUSERS\STANIA_JONES\NEWMAP01.GSC

File Edit Zoom Search Add Options Tools Help

1:1

Planning Policy - BG HER Output Data (Frank) [Read-Only]

BLAENAU GWENT HER 2011

wat GGAT PRN Q6663c

NAME SITE NAME NOT KNOWN

form -

NGR SO19940995

EASTING 0 NORTHING 0

COMMUNITY Nantyglo and Blaina

initary Blaenau Gwent origin GGAT copyright GGAT

compiled on -

SITE STATUS -

PERIOD Post-Medieval

TYPE Building

BROADCLASS Unassigned

CONDITION Near intact

Speed Bar Options: [F1] Help Record 489

start | Inboxes - Microsoft Out... | Blaenau Gwent Count... | User Control Manten... | GGP 2009 | 08:48