



**Day 1**                      **1400 hours**  
**SESSION 2**                **HOUSING (policy, numbers and phasing)**

**The Council has responded to a number of specific detailed questions posed by the Inspector in February 2012 (refer INSP001). The agenda for this session has been prepared in the light of information provided by the Council.**

1.     What evidence underpins the case for the Plan's proposed housing target and phasing in the light of recent construction rates, population movements, national guidance and policy? Does the Council's current target represent a realistic and soundly based target or is it an aspirational figure?
2.     How do the figures in the proposed site allocations match the various figures in Policies SP4 and SP5?
3.     To what extent will the amount of new housing anticipated rely on windfall development?
4.     Does the Council's target seek to promote too much housing without the increased employment base needed to support the level of population growth anticipated?
5.     What are the implications of increasing the overall supply of housing in the





**Inspector: Vincent Maher MA (Cantab) MSc MCD MBA MRTPI**  
**Programme officer: Jeanette John**  
**Website:**



**Day 3**  
**SESSION 7**

**1430 hours**  
**EMPLOYMENT AND MIXED USE SITES**

1. Is the allocation of employment and mixed use 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, policy designation and site boundaries drawn been based on appropriate criteria with a clear audit trail?

**Site MU1**

1. The Delivery and Implementation section of the Plan identifies some public sector grant for the delivery of MU1, the largest allocation of employment land to be “delivered”. To what extent is the delivery of this project dependent on public sector grant? Is the necessary public sector funding package in place to secure private sector investment?
2. What is the likely impact of developing MU1 on Rhyd y Blew and Bryn Serth SINC's? Will the development result in a significant loss of biodiversity and, if so, will it be necessary to conduct mitigation or compensation measures for any biodiversity loss?
3. Is it necessary to amend the site designation of MU1 including on the Proposals Map to identify green links? Are the boundaries of this site appropriately drawn?

**Site MU3**

1. Are the boundaries for this site soundly drawn? What would be the implications of amending them to incorporate adjacent land?

**Close 1700 hours**

**29 June 2012**



**Day 4**  
**SESSION 9**

**1300 hours**  
**BLAINA LOCAL TOWN CENTRE**

1. Does Policy DM7 provide an appropriate set of controls to manage changes of use within Blaina local town centre?
2. What is the land use planning case for restricting the percentages of hot food take aways and public houses in Blaina?

**Week 2**

**3 July 2012**

**Day 5**

**1000 hours**

**SESSION 10**

**MINERALS (Policies SP12, DM19 and M4)**

1. How does the Plan translate national minerals planning policy down to the local level?



**Day 5**                      **1530 hours**  
**SESSION 12**                **WASTE**

1. How does the Plan translate national and regional waste policy down to the local authority level? What is the logic for seeking to allocate between 0.4 and 4 hectares of land for waste management purposes?
2. Do Policies SP13 and W1 provide sufficient sites to accommodate the county borough's contribution to waste management?
3. How might the siting of waste facilities in criterion (3) of Policy DM21 be consistent with other initiatives to support employment growth?
- 4.





**5 July 2012**

**Day 7**

**1000 hours**

**SESSION 15      TURNING HEADS – SECURING QUALITY DESIGN  
(Urban design, place making, heritage, environmental  
improvements)**

1.    What initiatives does the Plan include to promote place making?  
Does Policy DM2 effectively stifle innovative development? Should  
the Plan identify policies in connection with the control of  
advertisements?
2.    How would roller shutters make a positive contribution to the street  
scene?
3.    Does Policy DM18 place too much emphasis on the preservation of  
heritage that is not statutorily listed over the desire to promote  
rest pr o?

**Day 7**  
**SESSION 16**

**1300 hours**  
**TRANSPORT**

1. Which of the various transport projects in the Plan are aspirations and which ones have a realistic chance of being delivered over the lifetime of the Plan? Which transport projects are critical to the delivery of the spatial strategy and the other targets in the Plan? Are there robust plans in place to deliver them? When will they be delivered?
2. Does the Plan give sufficient emphasis to the desire/ need to promote sustainable forms of transport including cycling?
3. How will Policy SP6 be implemented?
4. Should the Plan contain detailed policies concerning the levels of on site car parking, cycling and the facilitation of public transport that might be associated with new development? If not, why not? Should the Plan identify locally sensitive areas where transport assessments might be expected to be submitted along with planning applications?
5. FC11 seeks to amend cycle route T1.7. What is the logic for this amendment? Has this amended route been drawn having regard to surrounding land uses including farmland used for sheep grazing and an appreciation of the number of existing gateways?

**Close 1500 hours**



**Inspector: Vincent Maher MA (Cantab) MSc MCD MBA MRTPI**  
**Programme officer: Jeanette John**  
**Website:**

**Inspector: Vincent Maher MA (Cantab) MSc MCD MBA MRTPI**  
**Programme officer: Jeanette John**  
**Website:**

