

SD30



Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council  
Cyngor Bwrdeisdref Sirol Blaenau Gwent

# Candidate Site Methodology Methhodoleg Sa e'r Ymgeisydd

Deposit Local Development Plan  
Cynllun Adeneuo Datblygu Lleol

March/Mawrth 2011  
[www.blaenau-gwent.gov.uk](http://www.blaenau-gwent.gov.uk)

## **CONTENTS**

**Page**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

**1**



## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1** As part of the early stages of the plan preparation, in April 2007, the Council formally invited all developers, landowners, agents, Council departments with an interest in land to submit sites they wished to be considered for development or reuse through the LDP, for a range of uses, including housing, employment, retail, leisure, waste, transport, open space and other community uses. This was undertaken by local advertisements including the Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council's website, and through direct correspondence with developers and landowners. The sites submitted as part of the process are referred to as candidate sites. The submission of a candidate site for consideration by the Council does not imply that the site is suitable or otherwise for development. For each site proposed, a candidate site submission form was completed regarding the site's suitability for inclusion in the Blaenau Gwent Local Development Plan (LDP). The deadline for the submission of sites for inclusion in the LDP process was 19<sup>th</sup> December 2008.
- 1.2** In total 203 sites, ranging in size were submitted for consideration.
- 1.3** In order to ensure that land identified in the Local Development Plan is capable of development and can contribute to the delivery of the Strategy, candidate sites have undergone stringent assessments to determine their suitability for further consideration as part of the LDP.
- 1.4** The stringent assessments are outlined in this paper and have been designed to ensure that there is a clear, transparent and objective assessment procedure in place, which makes the process accessible to all interested persons and organisations. The assessment procedure can be categorised into a number of stages, each of which will be examined in more detail in the following chapters of this Background Paper.

## **2.0 LDP SITE ASSESSMENT CATEGORY REFERENCE**

- 2.1** The following references have been assigned to sites assessed as part of the LDP candidate site assessment process:

## CANDIDATE SITE METHODOLOGY BACKGROUND PAPER

Only sites greater than or equal to 0.3 hectares were considered as part of the









**Figure 1: Colour Coding System**

	In conformity with the sieving criteria		Not relevant to sieving criteria
	Possibly in conflict with the sieving criteria / some constraints identified	?	Insufficient information is available - a potential for conflict may exist
	In conflict with the sieving criteria		

5.18 No sites were discounted for further consideration at this stage and all progressed to stage 5.

## Stage 5: Assessment of the site against the LDP Sustainability Objectives

5.19 It was important to analyse each site in sustainability terms and to assess how they performed against each of the sustainability objectives as part of the Blaenau Gwent Sustainability Appraisal (including Strategic Environmental Assessment). The objectives form part of the Sustainability Appraisal framework which is a set of objectives, indicators and targets which will be used to assess the sustainability implications of the LDP. This was first issued in draft as part of the SA/SEA Scoping Report and following consultation, the objectives have been revised and approved Sust97 and followide Tcls03 Tc 0. Tc 0.cano asfref of t Tc ln1034 Tw -17955 0 T469 Td p T47

---

**Figure 2: Colour Coding System including scores**

<b>+3 pts</b>	In conformity with the sieving criteria	<b>0 pts</b>	Not relevant to sieving criteria
<b>- 1 pt</b>	Possibly in conflict with the sieving criteria / some constraints identified	<b>? - 1 pt</b>	Insufficient information is available - a potential for conflict may exist
<b>- 3 pts</b>	In conflict with the sieving criteria		

# CANDIDATE SITE METHODOLOGY BACKGROUND PAPER

# APPENDICES

# CANDIDATE SITE METHODOLOGY BACKGROUND PAPER

# General Planning Assessment Proforma (Stage 1)

## General Information

~~DA~~ ..... ~~DA~~ .....

~~CR....~~

1. ~~EN~~ .....

2. ~~MS~~ .....

3. ~~EN~~ .....

4. ~~MS~~ .....

5. ~~MS~~ .....

6. ~~MS~~

7. ~~MS~~

Yes

No

Unknown

# APPENDIX 1: GENERAL PLANNING ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

## UDP Assessment

10

## Relationship to existing settlement

11a ~~Within~~

<del>h</del>	<del>N</del>	<del>h</del>
Within existing settlement		
Rounding off settlement		
Edge of settlement		
Out of settlement		

11b ~~Within~~

Yes          No

## Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses

12. ~~Within~~

Yes          No

~~6/15~~

.....

.....

.....

## Accessibility

13a ~~Within~~

Yes          No

~~6~~

...

...



13b ~~13b~~

~~61ps~~

Yes No

13c ~~13c~~

~~1179~~

Yes No

~~61~~

.....  
.....  
.....

Sites of National Importance for Biodiversity

14 ~~14~~

~~13pna~~

~~acbb~~

~~119~~

	N	S	R	W
<del>119</del>				
<del>119</del>				
<del>119</del>				
<del>119</del>				
<del>119</del>				

~~61~~

.....  
.....  
.....

14 ~~14~~

~~119~~

Yes No Unknown – need further information

Flood Risk

15 ~~15~~

~~13pna~~

	N	R		
Zone A				
Zone B				
Zone C1				
Zone C2				



# APPENDIX 1: GENERAL PLANNING ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

6

...

...

...

15 ~~15~~  
notes

~~15~~

(see guidance

Yes            No

Planning History

16 ~~16~~ ~~16~~



18  
18  
18

6113

U	M	h	
R			
G H BB			
R			
M			
G L			
G E			
P			



inside or outside of the exiting settlement boundary. Where existing designations are identified, comments should be made to the efficacy of the policy.

#### 11a and 11b Relationship to the existing settlements

This question refers specifically to how the site relates to the existing settlement. Rather than using the current settlement boundaries as defined in the UDP, a common sense approach should be applied and where a development does abut existing settlement, even though it might be outside our current settlement boundaries, we consider the site as 'edge of settlement'. In addition, where a proposed site appears to logically 'round-off' a settlement, 'rounding-off' should be identified as opposed to 'edge of settlement', 'at' settlement and 'within existing settlement' are self-explanatory.

This assessment should be supported by comments and a decision made on whether this location would be acceptable as a Yes or No answer.

#### 12. Compatibility with neighbouring uses

The second stage of the assessment process will involve environmental health carrying out an in-depth analysis of noise exposure/ air pollution/ contaminated land etc. The general planning assessment does not need to provide a detailed assessment on potential conflict but identify where conflicts may occur, such as residential proposed to an existing employment site or proximity to a major road. A common sense approach needs to be adopted based upon professional judgement.

#### 13a-c. Accessibility

The detailed appraisal of the sites (second stage) of the process will involve Highways and Transport carrying out further analysis of accessibility issues. This proforma asks very general questions about accessibility of the site from the existing highway network and the physical location of the site in relation to a public transport access point and a community facility.

#### 14a and b. Sites of national importance for biodiversity that would prohibit development

There are several sites that have been recognised as being nationally important in terms of biodiversity within Blaenau Gwent County Borough, and as a result there will be a strong presumption against development. The County Borough has 3 sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), 2 Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and a National Nature Reserve (NNR).

Even if the site is not located within any of the designations, it may be the case that sites that are directly adjacent to these designations may have an unacceptable impact.

## APPENDIX 1: GENERAL PLANNING ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

### 15a and b. Flood Risk

Please indicate whether a site falls to a flood risk zone. Where it is indicated as both C1 and C2 the Environment Agency have confirmed that it should be treated as a C1 zone. The amount of the site that is located in each of the flood risk zones should be identified if appropriate.

The figure below gives a description of zones:

Figure 1

Zone	Description	Notes
A	Considered to be at little or no risk of fluvial or tidal/coastal flooding.	Used to indicate that justification test is not applicable and no need to consider flood risk further.
B	Areas known to have flooded in the past evidenced by sedimentary deposits.	Used as a part of a precautionary approach to indicate where site levels should be checked against the extreme (0.1%) flood level. If site levels are greater than the flood levels used to define adjacent extreme flood outline there is no need to consider flood risk further.
C	Based on Environment Agency extreme flood outline, equal to or greater than 0.1% (river, tidal or coastal)	Used to indicate that flooding issues should be considered as an integral part of decision making by the application of the justification test including assessment of consequences.
C1	Areas of the floodplain which are developed and served by significant infrastructure, including flood defences.	Used to indicate that development can take place subject to the application of justification test, including acceptability of consequences.
C2	Area of the floodplain without significant flood defence infrastructure	Used to indicate that only less vulnerable development should be considered subject to application of justification test, including acceptability of consequences. Emergency services and highly vulnerable development should not be considered.

Welsh Assembly Government (2004) Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk

Figure 2 needs to be given consideration in relation to the proposed use suggested for the site. For instance, residential development is considered 'highly vulnerable' therefore it should not be considered in a C2 flood risk zone. A decision in relation to this should be made to identify whether the proposed development would be acceptable in relation to these designations.





## APPENDIX 1: GENERAL PLANNING ASSESSMENT PROFORMA



## HIGHWAY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

To assess the potential impact of proposed developments on the existing Highway Network as part of the Local Development Plan (LDP) process.

January 2008



## APPENDIX 2: HIGHWAY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

TITLE



General site information

Site Name:

Site Location:

Site Reference No.

Site Area:

Type of development proposed:

General site description:

Potential impact on existing highway network resulting from the proposed development

Is a trip generation calculation/survey required?

YES – Trip Generation Calculation Survey required

NO – No calculation required. (proceed to Question 7)

1. Estimated Trip generation as result of development:

## APPENDIX 2: HIGHWAY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

- b. Provide detailed description of existing highway conditions: (e.g. Evidence of operational, topographical, environmental and safety issues that exist on both the local and wider road network).

<p><u>Observations</u></p>
----------------------------

3. To what extent would the use of land for the stated purpose impact on the existing highway network in terms of traffic generation?

Estimated increase in vehicular trips on existing network as a result of the development:

- a. Estimated increase in total number of trips made: (Use estimated AADT in Q.1c)

\_\_\_\_\_

- b. What is the estimated percentage increase of vehicles on the existing highway network as a result of the traffic generated by the development?

$$\frac{\text{Estimated increase in total number of trips}}{\text{Estimated current Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)}} \times 100 = \text{_____} \%$$

- c. Does traffic to and from the development exceed 10% of the two way flow on the adjoining highway?

YES –Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) recommended

NO



d. Does the traffic flow to and from the development exceed 5% of the two-way flow on the adjoining highway where congestion exists?

YES – Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) recommended

NO

4. What implications would this increase in vehicular traffic have on the existing highway network in terms of both creating and or exacerbating existing network problems (As listed in Q.2b)

Please list all operational, topographical and safety issues:

5. Are there any other candidate LDP developments in the area that may in conjunction with this one, have a collective negative impact on the surrounding highway network?

YES  NO

If yes, please specify site name and implications:

6. on the existing  
r capacity  
g Agreement.

Recommendations:

## APPENDIX 2: HIGHWAY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

### Accessibility onto existing highway network

7. Is there an existing access to the site: YES  NO
8. Is the existing access(s) and road it adjoins (if private drive, farm lane etc) adequate to facilitate the movement of traffic generated by the development (Refer to Q.1c&e for projected trip generation).

YES  NO

9. Provide general description of existing access point(s) and road? (Mark on plan).

10. Considering the area of the development and the proposed use, how many access points would be recommended (Mark preferred access point(s) on plan provided).

Number of access points recommended

11. If a new access or accesses were required to the site, onto what hierarchy of road would it/they have to adjoin?

County Route (Class 1)  Distributor Route (Class 2)   
Residential Road (Class 3 & Unclassified)  Private, Un-adopted/Other

12. What is the potential of physically providing a new access point(s) onto the existing highway network: (Place 'X' appropriate box for each access point).

Easy access obtainable to existing Highway

Relatively easy access obtainable, although some constraints present

Difficult to provide access to site due to numerous constraints

Access cannot be provided due to severity of constraints



13. Would a Section 278 Highway Agreement be required to help facilitate access to the site?

YES  NO

Recommendation:

Please 'X' appropriate box and provide a summary explanation for recommendation:

Site IS suitable to be developed for its intended purpose.

Brief reason for recommendation:

Site is NOT suitable to be developed for its intended purpose.

Brief reason for recommendation:

## APPENDIX 2: HIGHWAY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

### Explanatory Note for Highway Assessment Proforma

#### General site information

This section is to be completed by using the information provided by the Planning Division and is located at the front of their assessment proforma that is attached to each site plan. The information provides a general overview of the site including its location, size, number of proposed units (residential), reference number, existing and proposed usage (note: highway assessment to consider Planning Officers recommendation for development type and NCA and owners recommendation) as well as a general description of site conditions.

#### Potential impact on existing highway infrastructure resulting from the proposed development

The allocation of land for development will, depending on its proposed use, have a varying level of impact on the surrounding highway infrastructure. It is therefore important to try and foresee what the potential impact each type and size of development may have on the existing network hierarchy.

Not all sites will require TRICS survey/calculation and therefore, the highway engineer must determine each site on its individual merits. Sites below 20 no. units may be appraised at the time of the site inspection and if there are no concerns with regards to highway conditions, hierarchy and capacity, then no survey is required.

Using a trip generation database (TRICS) to provide traffic flow data for varying types and sizes of development it is possible to estimate the level of traffic likely to be generated as a result of a proposed development.







## APPENDIX 2: HIGHWAY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

Q. 6 – This question considers the impact of the proposed increase in traffic generated by the proposed development and whether any works to the existing network carried out via a Section 106 Planning Agreement would be required to allow for the expected increase in traffic levels on the surrounding network.

### Accessibility onto the existing highway network

An assessment of existing and potential access points to the development site is required. Whilst it is accepted that most sites may be made physically accessible at a cost, it is important to recognise what constraints may inhibit this and the potential difficulties that must be overcome.

Q. 7 – Asks whether the site can be accessed by vehicles from the existing highway.

Q. 8 – A site may currently be accessible from a highway, however the current access may not be suitable for the proposed development use. Current access may be narrow, un-surfaced etc and form part of a private drive or access lane before joining with the public highway some distance away. It is therefore necessary to consider the existing access and whether it is suitable to handle the volume of traffic generated by the development (trip generation figures from Q. 1 c&e). Factors to be considered are access visibility, highway alignments, type of road, lane the access exits onto and its width, class, usage, purpose etc.

Q. 9 – The consultant is required to provide a general description of the existing access point(s) to the site, considering the above factors. Existing access points are to be referenced on a plan and accompanied by photographs.

Q. 10 – The number of access/egress points required to the site is dependant on the size of the development and when considering residential developments the number of units present.

For example under most circumstances, good practice is that a residential development will have one access/egress point for every 300 units on site.

Q. 11 – An important factor that must be considered when assessing potential new access points is Blaenau Gwent's C. B. C's road hierarchy.

Mark the appropriate box(s) for each potential access/egress point required.

The purpose of this hierarchy is to facilitate efficient use of the highway network and control what transport and development access arrangements may be permitted at what point on the highway.

Q. 12 - The potential to access a site has been graded into four categories of difficulty depending on existing constraints. The consultant must use his/her judgement to assess the potential of providing a suitable access while considering the severity of constraint that may inhibit access to the site:

1. Easy access obtainable to existing highway
2. Relatively easy access obtainable, although some constraints present
3. Difficult to provide access to site due to numerous constraints
4. Access cannot be provided due to severity of constraints



Q. 14 – A developer and Highway Authority may, if required, enter into a Section 278 Highway Agreement to allow for the execution of works to highway to allow access to a development site.

The consultant must envisage whether alterations to the existing highway (i.e. widening of existing junction, layout changes, provision of a roundabout, left/right turning lanes, footway changes etc) may be necessary to allow access to the site therefore whether a Section 278 Highway Agreement will be required to facilitate these works.

### Recommendation

The consultant is required to use the evidence that has been collected for the completion of the proforma to determine whether the site 'is' or 'is not' suitable for the proposed development.

The consultant is required to mark an 'X' in the appropriate box and provide a brief summary referencing evidence in the proforma that supports the final decision.

### Completion of the proforma

The assessing officer is required to sign and date each completed proforma.

## APPENDIX 2: HIGHWAY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA



# BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

To assess the potential impact of proposed developments on  
biodiversity features

February 2008

General Site Information

1. Site Name:
2. Site Location:
3. Grid Reference
4. Site Reference No.
5. Site Area:
6. Type of development proposed:
7. General site description:



## Biodiversity Assessment

8. Is the site within or adjacent to an International or European Designated Wildlife Site (ie. Special Area of Conservation) including any candidate or proposed sites?

Within YES NO

Adjacent to YES NO

(Mark extent of site on plan provided and list sites below)

9. Is the site within or adjacent to a Nationally Designated Wildlife Site including any candidate or proposed sites? (ie. National Nature Reserve or Site of Special Scientific Interest). (Underline the relevant designation)

Within YES NO

Adjacent to YES NO

(Mark extent of site on plan provided and list sites below)

10. Is the site within a Locally Designated Wildlife Site including any candidate or proposed sites? (ie. Local Nature Reserve or Site of Importance for Nature Conservation) (Underline the relevant designation)

Within YES NO

Adjacent to YES NO

(Mark extent of site on plan provided and list sites below)

11. Are there records of European Protected Species for this site?

## APPENDIX 3: BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

12. Are there records for species protected under UK legislation (including Wildlife Countryside Act 1991 (as amended), and The Protection of Badgers Act 1992) (included above)?

YES NO

List species below

13. Are there records for species protected under Section 42 of the NERC Act 2006?

YES NO

List species below

14. Are there any UK Priority Habitats?

YES NO

List habitats below

15.



16. Does the site support habitat suitable for supporting protected species?

YES  NO

List the habitat and potential species below:

Habitat	Potential Species

17. Does the site contain "stepping stones" or wildlife corridors (not included above)?

YES  NO

18. Does the site contain woodland?

YES  NO

19. Is the site listed on the Register of Ancient Woodland?

YES  NO

Ancient Semi natural

Ancient Replanted

(Mark extent on plan provided)

20. Does the site contain Ancient /Veteran Trees?

YES  NO

(Mark Ancient/Veteran Trees on plan provided)

21. Does the site contain hedgerows?

YES  NO

Have any been identified as important under the Hedgerow Regs?

YES  NO  No survey information

(Mark hedgerows and Important hedgerows on plan provided)



## APPENDIX 3: BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

### 22. Summary of Biodiversity Constraints

### 23. Are Biodiversity constraints significant enough to prevent development of:

The whole site?	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Part of the site?	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

(Identify parts of the site that should be excluded from development)

### 24. What additional ecological surveys/assessments will be required for this site?

### 25. If part of the site can be developed, provide outline mitigation proposals and possible new benefits.

### Additional comments / observations:



Biodiversity Summary:

Accept Principle of allocation:	Yes, whole of site	...
	Yes, Part of site	...
	No	...

## APPENDIX 3: BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENT PROFORMA



# COUNTRYSIDE AND LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

To assess the potential impact of proposed developments on  
countryside and landscape features

February 2008



## Countryside & Landscape Assessment

12. Does the site lie within a Green Wedge on the Unitary Development Plan

YES  NO

13. Summary of Landscape Constraints

14. Are Landscape constraints significant enough to prevent development of:

The whole site? YES  NO

Part of the site? YES  NO

(Identify parts of the site that should be excluded from development)

15. What additional landscape surveys/assessments will be required for this site?





Countryside and Landscape Summary:





SITE REFERENCE NO.  
SITE LOCATION:-  
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED:-  
OFFICER'S NAME:-

CRITERIA

OFFICER COMMENTS

SITE OBSERVATIONS

SIGNATURE 95.NT

		WITH CURRENT DEFRA GUIDANCE (USING THE CLEA MODEL) AND HAVING REGARD TO CLR 7 TO 11. REASON:-

ARE THERE ANY NEIGHBOURING LDP DEVELOPMENT SITES THAT MAY, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THIS ONE, HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT: YES/NO \_\_\_\_\_  
 IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY SITE NAME AND ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

**SUMMARY**

SITE IS SUITABLE FOR INTENDED PURPOSE	<input type="checkbox"/>
FURTHER INFORMATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO A DECISION ON WHETHER SITE IS SUITABLE FOR ITS INTENDED PURPOSE	<input type="checkbox"/>
DETAIL OF FURTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED	
SITE IS <u>NOT</u> SUITABLE FOR INTENDED PURPOSE	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRIEF REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION	
CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVE PROPOSED USE:-	





For further Information please contact:

Planning Policy Team  
Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council  
Business Resource Centre  
Tafarnaubach Industrial Estate  
Tredegar, Blaenau Gwent  
NP22 3AA

Tel. 01495 354740/355538/355544/355501  
email. [planningpolicy@blaenau-gwent.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@blaenau-gwent.gov.uk)  
or visit [www.blaenau-gwent.gov.uk](http://www.blaenau-gwent.gov.uk)

