

Bridgend Local Development Plan Examination

<http://www.bridgend.gov.uk/ldpexamination>

Monday 4 March 2013 10.00am

Session 19 – Alternative Sites

Inspector's SUPPLEMENTARY Agenda with Matters and Issues

6. AS027 – TY DRAW FARM, PYLE (CORNELLY PARISH)

- 6.1 There is a supplementary matter that was not addressed in the original agenda.

Qn6a. The proposed allocation would provide for 94 dwellings which corresponds to the current planning application which proposes 94 mainly detached and semi-detached dwellings on 3.8ha (with 2.2ha of employment development). Why does the Council support a development of only 25dph here when LDP Policy COM4 normally seeks a density of 35dph?

7. AS060 – ENLARGE Y PARC, MAESTEG ALLOCATION (RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT)

- 7.1 Paragraph 1.3 of the original agenda refers to 4 of the Alternative Sites which the Council is now supporting for inclusion in the Local Development Plan for additional housing and other development. Unfortunately that omitted a fifth site which the Council is also supporting part of AS060 Enlarge Y Parc, Maesteg allocation for an additional 31 dwellings.
- 7.2 This site is wholly within the Maesteg settlement boundary. 1.31ha is proposed for 20 low density dwellings by LDP Policy COM1(20). Whereas the Alternative Site representations sought to extend the site by 5.7ha to a total of about 6.95ha with up to 150 dwellings, the Council would only support a marginal expansion of the allocation to 1.6ha to accommodate an additional 31 dwellings to make a total of 51 dwellings on the combined site. Delivery is expected by the Representor to be in the third phase of the Plan (After April 2016).
- 7.3 The Council has identified access as a major constraint on the development of the larger site. 51 dwellings is the maximum number that the Highway Authority would support to be achieved by 3 different access points (24 via West Road, 20 via Bryn Celyn and 7 via Yr Ysfa).
- 7.4 Document SD09 describes the site as brownfield 'but partly regenerated' land on and adjacent to former coal levels, quarries and a tramway. The questionnaire response describes it as greenfield. The larger site is described as being within 150 of a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and as being a potential bat habitat. The highway comments refer to a need to safeguard a community route through the site.

Qn7a. Why does the COM1(200 allocation propose low density development of 20 dwellings on 1.3ha (15.4hph) but the enlarged

site allocation (using much of the same land) would be for 51 dwellings on 1.6ha (32dph)?

Qn7b. From where would access be taken as the suggested location for the housing fronting Westfield Avenue does not abut any of the 3 access points suggested by the highway authority?

Qn7c. Why could the surrounding roads not support more development as sought by the Representor if road improvements were made as suggested in the questionnaire response?

Qn7d. Could a spine road through the larger site relieve surrounding roads?

Qn7e. Where is the community route that was shown as a UDP proposals and has this been implemented?

Qn7f. Where is the SINC land?

Qn7g. Does the proposed or larger site have any current recreational or other uses and would these need to be retained or replaced?

Qn7h. What use could be made of any other undeveloped land?

Qn7i. Is the site brownfield or greenfield?

21 February 2013