

**Powys County Council**  
**Local Development Plan**  
**2011 - 2026**

**Session 14 – Thursday 4 May 2017 09:30 – 17:00**

**ALTERNATIVE SITES 3**

**Powys County Council's Statement**







**Powys LDP Examination**

**HEARING SESSION 14**

**ALTERNATIVE SITES 3**

**Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> May 2017**

**POWYS COUNTY COUNCIL'S STATEMENT**

This Statement has been produced by Powys County Council to set out its response to the matters and issues raised by the Inspector for the Hearing relating to Alternative Sites in the submitted Powys Local Development Plan.

This Statement relates to the elements of the Plan that have been raised by the Inspector as matters to be discussed. Where appropriate the Statement draws on and cross-refers to the main sources of information used in the preparation of the Plan such as the outcomes of public consultation, the Sustainability Appraisal, the Background Documents and the supporting Topic Papers. Document reference numbers are given where appropriate.

For the purpose of clarity within this statement any Matters Arising Changes suggested to the Further Focussed Changes to the Plan, are shown underlined in red when additions, or ~~blue~~ strikethrough where deletions.

**1. Introduction**

**2. Procedural Matters**

### **ALTERNATIVE SITES 3**

ASN83: Rhayader, Bryngwy Fields, South Street

ASN91: Ystragynlais Area, land north of Bryn y Groes Farm

ASN92: Ystradgynlais Area, land at Bryn y Groes Farm

ASN94: Ystradgynlais Area, Sports ground, NW of bowling green

ASDB4: Three Cocks, land at

ASN39: Three cocks, land adjoining Oldcastle Avenue

ASDB5: Glasbury, land to the SE of the cross-roads on the C0072

| QUESTION   | COUNCIL RESPONSE   |
|--|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>   | <b>ASN83 Rhayader, Bryngwy Fields, South Street</b>  |
| <b>a) What is the current status of the site?</b>                                    | The site is agricultural/greenfield and lies within the Plan's development limits shown on Inset Map P52 (LDP42). The site is a UDP allocation (R85 HA3) which has remained undeveloped during the Plan period. Planning permission on the site was refused in 2010 (RAD/2007/0332) on the grounds of inadequate provision of affordable housing and inadequate outdoor recreational facility provision. An application for 4 units on the south-eastern part of the UDP allocation was withdrawn in 2016. |
| <b>b) What is the size of the site and how many units will be delivered on site?</b> | 1.23Ha<br>As the Council is not promoting this site this is for the site promoter to propose but at a density of 27 per hectare (Policy H3, LDP42) this would allow for approximately 33 on the site.  |
| <b>c) Would the site contribute to the aims and objectives of the Plan?</b>          | Sufficient sites that can accommodate an appropriate number of dwellings have been identified, assessed and allocated in the Plan to meet the evidence based housing requirement of the Plan. Allocated sites are aligned to the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy and contribute to meeting needs as set out in the Housing Delivery Trajectory.   |
| <b>d) Is the allocation of the site consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy?</b> | Were this site allocated it would be consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy.  |
| <b>e) Are there any significant constraints or barriers to the</b>                   | No.  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>development of the site?</b>   |  |
| <b>f) Are there any infrastructure requirements for this site and how / when will they be delivered?</b>  | As the Council is not promoting this site this is for the representor to demonstrate.  |
| <b>g) What are the proposed timescales for delivery of this site?</b>   | As the Council is not promoting this site this is for the representor to propose.  |
| <b>h) Has a development viability assessment been carried out? If so, what are its conclusions?</b>   | The Council is not aware of any site specific viability assessment carried out by the site proposer in connection with the proposed development of this alternative site.  |
| <b>i) What would be the implications of the site and/or supporting infrastructure not coming forward within the anticipated timescales for delivery of the Plan's housing and development strategy?</b> | As the Council is not promoting this site this is for the representor to explain.<br><br>The Alternative site has been a UDP allocation but has not come forward for delivery and cannot, therefore, be relied upon to support meeting the LDP dwelling requirement. |

| QUESTION   | COUNCIL RESPONSE   |
|--|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>   | <b>ASN91: Ystradgynlais Area, land north of Bryn y Groes Farm</b>  |
| <b>a) What is the current status of the site?</b>                                    | Greenfield – pasture   |
| <b>b) What is the size of the site and how many units will be delivered on site?</b> | <p>7.31Ha.</p> <p>As the Council is not promoting this site this is for the site promoter to propose but at a density of 27 per hectare (Policy H3, LDP42) this would allow for approximately 197 units on the site.</p>   |
| <b>c) Would the site contribute to the aims and objectives of the Plan?</b>          | <p>No. Sufficient sites that can accommodate an appropriate number of dwellings have been identified, assessed and allocated in the Plan, in line with the needs of the Settlement Hierarchy and Housing Trajectory.</p> <p>The site lies outside the existing Unitary Development Plan development boundary for Ystradgynlais and is outside the proposed LDP development boundary for this Town. The LDP development boundary for this part of the Town is proposed to run along the southern and eastern sides of this site.</p> <p>Ystradgynlais is a town in a Welsh Speaking stronghold and as such, is subject to Policy DM14 – Development in Welsh Speaking Strongholds. As a site for 10+ units, site ASN91 would be subject to Policy DM14 and a Language Action Plan setting out</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | measures to protect, promote and enhance Welsh Language and Culture will be required.  |
| <b>d) Is the allocation of the site consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy?</b>                     | Were this site to be allocated it would be consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy.  |
| <b>e) Are there any significant constraints or barriers to the development of the site?</b>              | <p>Access to the site would need to be upgraded in order to use the access point for Brynygroes main site (P58 HA10). There would be encroachment into the open countryside and the upper part of the site is more elevated so issues of visual impact would need to be sufficiently mitigated. Lack of community support also cited in the Candidate Site Status Report (June 2015).</p> <p>DCWW have explained that additional flows from the alternative site would require improvements at Ystradgynlais WwTW. New sewers and water mains via the requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. WwTW improvements can be financed through the AMP programme or through developer contributions via S106 agreements.</p> |
| <b>f) Are there any infrastructure requirements for this site and how / when will they be delivered?</b> | Access issues would need to be resolved. Site not being promoted by the Council so the site promoter would need to answer this question.   |
| <b>g) What are the proposed timescales for delivery of this site?</b>                                    | This is for the promoter to answer   |
| <b>h) Has a development viability assessment been carried out? If so, what are its conclusions?</b>      | This is for the promoter to answer   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>i) What would be the implications of the site and/or supporting infrastructure not coming forward within the anticipated timescales for delivery of the Plan's housing and development strategy?</b> | <p>The Council is not promoting this site.</p> <p>An appropriate number of sites, accommodating a sufficient number of dwellings for the settlement have been identified in line with the Plan's Settlement Hierarchy and the Housing Trajectory. As such the allocation of this site would represent a surplus to the settlement's and the Plan's dwelling requirements.</p> |
|---|---|

| QUESTION   | COUNCIL RESPONSE   |
|--|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>   | <b>ASN92: Ystradgynlais Area, land at Bryn y Groes Farm (P58 HA10)</b>   |
| <b>a) What is the current status of the site?</b>  | Outline Planning Permission for 138 dwellings was approved on 29 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 (P/2014/1133)  |
| <b>b) What is the size of the site and how many units will be delivered on site?</b>                     | 4.54Ha. Appendix 1 states that the site has been allocated for 136 dwellings. However the Outline Planning Permission allows for 138 (including two dwellings which are to be demolished), so a net gain of 136 still applies. |
| <b>c) Would the site contribute to the aims and objectives of the Plan?</b>                              | Yes, through the provision of 136 dwellings.   |
| <b>d) Is the allocation of the site consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy?</b>                     | Were this site to be allocated it would be consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy.  |
| <b>e) Are there any significant constraints or barriers to the development of the site?</b>              | Not applicable   |
| <b>f) Are there any infrastructure requirements for this site and how / when will they be delivered?</b> | Not applicable   |
| <b>g) What are the proposed</b>  | Phase 2 and 3 (2017 to 2026)   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>timescales for delivery of this site?</b>  |   |
| <b>h) Has a development viability assessment been carried out? If so, what are its conclusions?</b>   | Not applicable  |
| <b>i) What would be the implications of the site and/or supporting infrastructure not coming forward within the anticipated timescales for delivery of the Plan's housing and development strategy?</b> | The LDP has allocated this site and therefore its non-delivery would impact on housing land supply. |

| QUESTION   | COUNCIL RESPONSE  |
|--|---|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>   | <b>ASN94: Ystradgynlais Area, Sports ground, NW of bowling green</b>  |
| <b>a) What is the current status of the site?</b>                                    | Amenity; existing sports ground, club house and community facility.   |
| <b>b) What is the size of the site and how many units will be delivered on site?</b> | <p>2.44Ha.</p> <p>As the Council is not promoting this site this is for the site promoter to propose but at a density of 27 per hectare (Policy H3, LDP42) this would allow for approximately 66 units on the site.</p> <p>There has been no contact from the landowner during the LDP process so cannot rely on the site. It lies within the development boundary so could be a windfall site, subject to compliance with the LDP's policies, including the loss of Open Space.</p>  |
| <b>c) Would the site contribute to the aims and objectives of the Plan?</b>          | <p>No. Sufficient sites that can accommodate an appropriate number of dwellings have been identified, assessed and allocated in the Plan, in line with the needs of the Settlement Hierarchy and Housing Trajectory.</p> <p>Ystradgynlais is a town in a Welsh Speaking stronghold and as such, is subject to Policy DM14 – Development in Welsh Speaking Strongholds. As a site for 10+ units, site ASN94 would be subject to Policy DM14 and a Language Action Plan setting out measures to protect, promote and enhance Welsh Language and Culture will be required.</p> |
| <b>d) Is the allocation of the site consistent with the Plan's Spatial</b>           | Were this site to be allocated it would be consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy.   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Strategy?</b>  |   |
| <b>e) Are there any significant constraints or barriers to the development of the site?</b>   | <p>Access is poor and would not cope with any intensification of use. Buffer zone required around adjacent waterway and ancient woodland. Ecology survey required. Site sits above a Category 2 Mineral deposit. Off-site sewerage required. The site was assessed and considered not appropriate so was not taken forward.</p> <p>DCWW have explained that Additional flows from the alternative sites would require improvements at Ystradgynlais WwTW. WwTW improvements can be financed through the AMP programme or through developer contributions via S106 agreements.</p> |
| <b>f) Are there any infrastructure requirements for this site and how / when will they be delivered?</b>  | See e) above. For the site promoter to answer   |
| <b>g) What are the proposed timescales for delivery of this site?</b>   | For the site promoter to answer   |
| <b>h) Has a development viability assessment been carried out? If so, what are its conclusions?</b>   | For the site promoter to answer   |
| <b>i) What would be the implications of the site and/or supporting infrastructure not coming forward within the anticipated timescales for delivery of the Plan's housing and</b> | For the site promoter to answer   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>development strategy?</b> |  |
|------------------------------|--|

| QUESTION   | COUNCIL RESPONSE   |
|--|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>   | <b>ASDB4: Three Cocks, land at,</b>  |
| <b>a) What is the current status of the site?</b>                                    | Greenfield. Disused railway line incorporated into agricultural pasture.   |
| <b>b) What is the size of the site and how many units will be delivered on site?</b> | 0.57Ha<br><br>As the Council is not promoting this site this is for the site promoter to propose but at a density of 27 per hectare (Policy H3, LDP42) this would allow for approximately 15 on the site.  |
| <b>c) Would the site contribute to the aims and objectives of the Plan?</b>          | No. Sufficient sites that can accommodate an appropriate number of dwellings have been identified, assessed and allocated in the Plan, in line with the needs of the Settlement Hierarchy and Housing Trajectory.<br><br>The site would represent an extension to the built form of the settlement in a northerly direction into open countryside possibly leading to an inappropriate bridging of the built form to the extent of coalescing with existing built form south of Glasbury. This could represent an unacceptable ribboning of development in a north-south direction along the A438. |
| <b>d) Is the allocation of the site consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy?</b> | Whilst Three Cocks is a Large Village and hence a settlement deemed suitable for further housing growth over the LDP period, the allocation of this particular site would be inconsistent with the proposed development boundary.<br><br>Designated development boundaries set the development limits for towns and large villages. They serve to control development, enabling a focus on the most efficient use of land and promoting cohesive development patterns. The LDP process has   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>provided scope for the Council to assess potential new sites and provide for logical settlement extensions where appropriate whilst ensuring that development boundaries prevent urban sprawl or ribbon development and protect the wider countryside.</p> <p>The site would represent an inappropriate extension of the built form into the open countryside against the Plan’s objectives to ensure the most efficient use of land. The allocated site and commitments will meet the identified housing needs for the settlement over the Plan period and the alternative site is neither suitable nor required for land allocation.</p> <p>The site would be contrary to other policies in the Plan including proposed Policy T1A [LDP42] which protects disused transport routes.</p> <p>A site at the southern end of Three Cocks has gained planning permission (P/2016/0786) for 39 units. This site, with other commitments meet the growth requirements and there is no need for this site to be allocated within the Plan.</p> |
| <p><b>e) Are there any significant constraints or barriers to the development of the site?</b></p> | <p>As identified at the Candidate Sites stage (Candidate Site 816), the site was not supported by the Highways Authority because the site frontage is too small and too steep to allow for an access to be created into this land from u/c road. Domestic access onto class 1 road would not be appropriate. There is insufficient road frontage to achieve visibility splays for access. No access off Class 1 road. The site is in the Middle Wye Valley historic landscape requiring sensitive design principles (subject to other constraints). An ecology survey will be required. Land Contamination identified the disused railway line and the adjoining sewerage works. A survey/conditions will be required. It is in a Cat 1 Sand &amp; Gravel safeguarding area and pre-extraction may be required.</p> <p>The most up-to-date comments from DCWW state that, “additional flows from the</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>alternative sites would require improvements at Three Cocks Aberllyfni WwTW. The site is in close proximity to the WwTW and may result in odour issues for future residents. DCWW recommend that consultation is undertaken with PCC environmental protection department to determine whether it may be appropriate to provide a buffer area between the works and the development to ensure that no statutory odour nuisance is created.”</p> <p>The site is within the 132m and 250m consultation area of a protected National Grid LNG gas pipeline. Consultation with HSE would be required with regards vulnerable development with limited access.</p> |
| <b>f) Are there any infrastructure requirements for this site and how / when will they be delivered?</b>  | See e) above. This is for the site promoter to answer.  |
| <b>g) What are the proposed timescales for delivery of this site?</b>   | As the Council is not promoting this site this is for the representor to propose.   |
| <b>h) Has a development viability assessment been carried out? If so, what are its conclusions?</b>   | The Council is unaware of any viability assessment having been carried out in relation to this site. The Viability Assessment Update (August 2016) [EB13] indicates that for Central Powys, affordable housing contributions of 30% would be sought.  |
| <b>i) What would be the implications of the site and/or supporting infrastructure not coming forward within the anticipated timescales for delivery of the Plan’s housing and development strategy?</b> | As the Council is not promoting this site, there are considered to be no implications for the Plan’s housing and development strategy.  |

| QUESTION   | COUNCIL RESPONSE  |
|--|---|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>   | <b>ASN39: Three Cocks, land adjoining Oldcastle Avenue</b>  |
| <b>a) What is the current status of the site?</b>                                    | Greenfield, arable land   |
| <b>b) What is the size of the site and how many units will be delivered on site?</b> | 2.91Ha<br>As the Council is not promoting this site this is for the site promoter to propose but at a density of 27 per hectare (Policy H3, LDP42) this would allow for approximately 79 on the site.   |
| <b>c) Would the site contribute to the aims and objectives of the Plan?</b>          | <p>No. Sufficient sites that can accommodate an appropriate number of dwellings have been identified, assessed and allocated in the Plan, in line with the needs of the Settlement Hierarchy and Housing Trajectory.</p> <p>The site is being seen as an extension of allocated site P53 MUA1 which has planning permission for mixed commercial and residential use including 39 dwellings (P/2016/0786). This application was a departure application because the site is not allocated in the UDP. Notwithstanding this, P53 MUA1 is allocated for mixed use in the LDP due to its planning history for industrial use and sensitive design would enable a revised employment scheme to come forward in conjunction with a residential scheme. Nevertheless, inclusion of this alternative site would represent a further unacceptable and inappropriate extension into open countryside at this time. The LDP has allocated a proportionate residential dwelling number relative to its Mixed Use allocation according to a strategic settlement hierarchy, which recognises a settlements capacity to accommodate development taking into account the services and infrastructure of the settlement and the planning permission has provided for a</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | greater density. Allocating additional land solely for residential use would extend the built form of the settlement without good reason.  |
| <b>d) Is the allocation of the site consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy?</b> | <p>Whilst Three Cocks is a Large Village and hence a settlement deemed suitable for further housing growth over the LDP period, the allocation of this particular site is inconsistent with the proposed development boundary.</p> <p>Designated development boundaries set the development limits for towns and large villages. They serve to control development, enabling a focus on the most efficient use of land and promoting cohesive development patterns. The LDP process has provided scope for the Council to assess potential new sites and provide for logical settlement extensions where appropriate whilst ensuring that development boundaries prevent urban sprawl and protect the wider countryside.</p> <p>A site of this size and scale is not consistent with the Plan's growth apportionment which, in terms of overall dwelling requirement for this settlement over the Plan period, determined a starting point of growth for Three Cocks of 16 dwellings. The currently permitted development accounts for all the growth requirement of Three Cocks and the residual requirement of the adjoining settlement of Glasbury.</p> <p>The site would represent an inappropriate and unnecessary extension into the open countryside against the Plan's objectives to ensure the most efficient use of land. The Council is of the view that the allocated site selected for Three Cocks is sufficient for development during the Plan period. The allocated site will meet the identified housing needs for the settlement over the Plan period and the alternative site is neither suitable nor required for land allocation.</p> |
| <b>e) Are there any significant constraints or barriers to the</b>                   | The most up-to-date comments from DCWW state that, "additional flows from the  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>development of the site?</b>   | <p>alternative sites would require improvements at Three Cocks Aberllyfni WwTW.</p> <p>Part of the site lies within C2 flood zone. The site overlies HER and is in the Middle Wye Valley Historic landscape. An ecology survey will be required. It is Cat 1 Sand &amp; Gravel and there may be pre-extraction requirements.</p> |
| <b>f) Are there any infrastructure requirements for this site and how / when will they be delivered?</b>  | This is for the site promoter to answer.   |
| <b>g) What are the proposed timescales for delivery of this site?</b>   | This is for the site promoter to answer.   |
| <b>h) Has a development viability assessment been carried out? If so, what are its conclusions?</b>   | The Council is unaware of any viability assessment having been carried out in relation to this site. The Viability Assessment Update (August 2016) [EB13] indicates that for Central Powys, affordable housing contributions of 30% would be sought.   |
| <b>i) What would be the implications of the site and/or supporting infrastructure not coming forward within the anticipated timescales for delivery of the Plan's housing and development strategy?</b> | As the Council is not promoting this site, there are considered to be no implications for the Plan's housing and development strategy.   |

| QUESTION  | COUNCIL RESPONSE   |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>ASDB5: Glasbury, land to the SE of the cross-roads on the C0072</b>   |
| <b>a) What is the current status of the site?</b>   | Greenfield. Agricultural pasture.  |
| <b>b) What is the size of the site and how many units will be delivered on site?</b>        | 0.13Ha<br>At a density of 27 per hectare (Policy H3, LDP42) this would allow for approximately 4 dwelling units on the site.   |
| <b>c) Would the site contribute to the aims and objectives of the Plan?</b>                 | As a Large Village in the settlement hierarchy it is appropriate that there are small areas of white land/unallocated land within the development boundary. The development boundaries therefore, as proposed contribute to the aims and objectives of the Plan, but the Plan is not reliant on the site being developed.  |
| <b>d) Is the allocation of the site consistent with the Plan's Spatial Strategy?</b>        | Yes. Designated development boundaries set the development limits for towns and large villages. They serve to control development, enabling a focus on the most efficient use of land and promoting cohesive development patterns. The LDP process has provided scope for the Council to assess potential new sites and provide for logical settlement extensions where appropriate whilst ensuring that development boundaries prevent urban sprawl and protect the wider countryside. The proposed development limit represents a consolidation of the settlement. |
| <b>e) Are there any significant constraints or barriers to the development of the site?</b> | This area of land is not an allocated site and provides scope for a development of less than 5 units. It has therefore, not been assessed through the LDP site assessment process but the Council is content that the proposed development limit represents a consolidation of the settlement.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>f) Are there any infrastructure requirements for this site and how / when will they be delivered?</b></p>  | <p>As a small site for less than 5 units it is available for development during the Plan period. As such it has not been through the LDP site selection and assessment process to identify infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The area is part of a larger candidate site (CS27) and major highways constraints were identified for the site. Third party involvement may be required to enable any development to come forward.</p> |
| <p><b>g) What are the proposed timescales for delivery of this site?</b></p>   | <p>The site is considered to be available for development during the Plan period; it is a small site with potential for less than 5 units so it is not an allocation but the proposed development limit represents a consolidation of the settlement. If developed it would be a windfall.</p>  |
| <p><b>h) Has a development viability assessment been carried out? If so, what are its conclusions?</b></p>   | <p>A viability assessment has not been carried out on this site because it is not an allocation and the issue relates to an objection to this area of land being included within the proposed development limit.</p>  |
| <p><b>i) What would be the implications of the site and/or supporting infrastructure not coming forward within the anticipated timescales for delivery of the Plan's housing and development strategy?</b></p> | <p>As this site is not an allocated site because of its size and the issue relates to an objection to the proposed development limit there are considered to be no implications for the Plan's housing and development strategy.</p>  |