

Bridgend Local Development Plan

2006-2021



Background Paper 3: Settlement Boundary Designation

March 2011

Bridgend Local Development Plan 2006 – 2021

Background Paper Three
Settlement Boundary Designation

March 2011

Development Planning
Regeneration and Development
Communities Directorate
Bridgend County Borough Council
Angel Street, Bridgend
CF31 4WB

Contents	Page Number
1. Introduction	2
2. Policy Guidance and Background Evidence	2
3. Methodology	6
Stage 1 - Boundary Updates	6
Stage 2 – Focussed Amendments	6
4. Relationship with Candidate Sites	8
5. Results	8
6. Implications for the LDP	8
7. Monitoring and Review	9
Appendix 1: candidate sites under 0.3 hectares	10
Appendix 2: candidate sites (over 0.3 hectares) recognised through settlement boundary review and assessed according to the Candidate Site Assessment	25

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Council recognises the value which people place on the countryside of the County Borough; and because of the increasing development pressures which are being placed upon it, a robust planning policy framework is essential to reconcile appropriate rural development with the need to protect the countryside. It is therefore necessary, for the Council to clearly define what it considers to be 'the countryside' for the purpose of its planning policies in the LDP.
- 1.2 The Council considers that the most effective way to achieve this is by defining clear, defensible boundaries around urban settlements in the form of 'settlement boundaries' beyond which there will be specific Policies to protect the countryside from development which would harm its distinctive character.
- 1.3 Bridgend is in a fortunate position as it benefits from a relatively up-to-date Development Plan, the Bridgend Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which has already defined settlement boundaries. This methodology therefore seeks to take these boundaries as a starting point, for revision where necessary for the purposes of effectively delivering the LDP Strategy, balancing the needs of growth and conservation.

2. Policy Guidance and Background Evidence

2.1 Planning Policy Wales (PPW) 2010

- 2.1.1 National and Regional Policy does not provide specific guidance on settlement boundaries but Planning Policy Wales (PPW) 2010, paragraph 4.5.4 states:
- 2.1.2 "The countryside is a dynamic and multi-purpose resource. In line with sustainability principles, it must be conserved and, where possible, enhanced for the sake of its ecological, geological, physiographic, historical, archaeological and agricultural value and for its landscape and natural resources, balancing the need to conserve these attributes against the economic, social and recreational needs of local communities and visitors".
- 2.1.3 The Council considers that the most effective means of delivering this overarching national planning policy guidance is to define appropriately drawn boundaries around its settlements, which are seen as important development management tools, providing greater certainty to developers and communities alike.

2.2 Bridgend Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

2.2.1 Policy EV12 of the adopted Bridgend Unitary Development Plan defines the 'main settlements' and 'smaller settlements' of the County Borough with designated settlement boundaries and states that development beyond them will not be permitted unless justified against Policy EV1 *Development in the Countryside*. As stated above, these boundaries have been used as a starting point for revision in accordance with the methodology applied in Section 3 of this report.

2.3 Settlement Role and Function Study

2.3.1 Baker Associates were commissioned to undertake analysis on the role and function of settlements in Bridgend County Borough. The Settlement Role and Function Study forms part of the evidence base informing the authority's Local Development Plan (LDP).

2.3.2 One of the objectives of the study was to identify the current role & function of settlements, their functional relationships with one-another, and their potential future roles broken down into the following categories:

- **Primary key settlements**
Settlements which have a critical role to play in the success of each region. Act as important local service and employment hubs for surrounding settlements and rural hinterlands.
- **Cross boundary settlements**
Settlements which have a particular role in linking with neighbouring regions.
- **Key settlements**
Smaller settlements which support communities but which are dependant upon the hubs for some key amenities.
- **Local service centres**
Market towns, large villages or an associated group of villages which have relatively good accessibility by non-car modes which should be identified as the preferred locations for most development in rural areas.

2.3.3 The Study has informed the settlement hierarchy of the LDP as expressed by Policy PLA 1 of the LDP, complementing and reinforcing the spatial distribution of growth. The Study has had a direct link to defining those settlements which can more appropriately accommodate growth in terms of their function, balanced against the requirement to effectively implement the regeneration-led spatial strategy of the LDP and Stage 2 of the methodology.

2.4 The Local Development Plan – Pre-Deposit Proposals and Preferred Strategy

2.4.1 The Local Development Plan (LDP) sets objectives and policies to control land use development throughout the County Borough over a plan period until 2021. Over this time the population of the County Borough will grow which will in turn result in a demand for new homes and associated infrastructural requirements.

2.4.2 In order to achieve the Vision and Objectives of the LDP the Council will implement the **Regeneration-Led Spatial Strategy** where regeneration is defined as a process of investing in an area of previous or current decline, to improve its physical, economic and social fabric. As a consequence therefore, this Regeneration Led Strategy requires the Council to focus development across the County Borough in accordance with its Regeneration priorities. This necessitates directing development to those areas currently subject to area based Regeneration Strategies and other priority areas where regeneration and investment is needed to address an identified and acknowledged decline in the social, economic and physical environment and provide much needed new development and facilities.

2.4.3 In terms of effectively delivering the LDP Spatial Strategy and how this has broadly informed the settlement boundary review (and its broad implications for the methodology) this is defined in Table 1 below.

2.4.4 Table 1 is based on a consideration at the Pre-Deposit and Preferred Strategy stage of the LDP and the effect of accommodating growth on individual settlements (see Table 9 of the LDP Pre-Deposit Proposals and Preferred Strategy). For the purposes of the LDP, the settlement boundary review (and Candidate Site Assessment methodology – see Candidate Site Assessment Report) this has since been refined, to take account of more in-depth analysis of the role and function of settlements, availability, location and capacity of key regeneration sites (the implementation of which are key to the delivery of the Regeneration-Led Strategy) and other LDP evidence that has informed the Plan and has become available since the Pre-Deposit Proposals was published.

TABLE 1: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF GROWTH AND IMPACT ON SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES.

Sub Area	Settlement	Impact on Settlement
Bridgend	Bridgend	Strategic Growth within existing settlement.
	Coity, Coychurch Laleston Penyfai	No Strategic Growth. Development within existing settlements.
The Llynfi Valley	Maesteg	Strategic Growth focused within existing settlement with amendments to settlement boundary.
	Caerau, Nantyffyllon	Strategic Growth focused within existing settlement with amendments to settlement boundaries.
	Cwmfelin, Pontrhydycyff, Llangynwyd	No Strategic Growth. Development within existing settlements.
Porthcawl	Porthcawl	Strategic Growth within existing settlement.
The Garw Valley	Blaengarw, Pontycymmer	No Strategic Growth. Development focused within existing settlement with minor amendments to settlement boundary.
	Bettws, Llangeinor Pontyrhyl	No Strategic Growth. Development within existing settlement.
The Ogmore Valley	Nantymoel, Ogmore Vale	No Strategic Growth. Development focused within existing settlement with minor amendments to settlement boundary.
	Blackmill, Evanstown, Glynogwr, Pantyravel,	No Strategic Growth. Development focused within existing settlement.
The Valley Gateway	Aberkenfig, Bryncethin, Brynmenyn, Sarn, Tondu.	Strategic Growth within existing settlement with minor amendments to settlement boundary
	Coytrahen	No Strategic Growth. Development within existing settlement.
Pyle/Kenfig/Cornelly Area	Pyle, North Cornelly, Kenfig Hill	No Strategic Growth. Development within existing settlement.
	Cefn Cribwr, Kenfig, Mawdlam South Cornelly	No Strategic Growth. Development within existing settlement.
Pencoed	Pencoed, Heol-Y-Cyw	No Strategic Growth. Development within existing settlement.

3. Methodology

3.1 Using the above as guidance the Council has undertaken a thorough review of settlement boundaries, to deliver sustainable patterns of development that will effectively deliver the LDP Strategy.

3.2 The first stage of the methodology used to define boundaries for all settlements was:-

Stage 1 - Boundary Updates

- Include curtilages of dwellings within settlements, where these were considered to be functionally and visually part of the urban area.
- Include areas of extant consents and those developments that have been developed on the edge of existing settlement boundaries that have previously been deemed to be part of the settlement.
- Include small-scale development opportunities which would provide infill and rounding off opportunities that are logical in terms of being physically, functionally and visually related to the existing urban area – taking account of any environmental development constraints.
- Include small-scale brownfield sites on the edge of settlements where these are logical in terms of being physically, functionally and visually related to the existing urban area – taking account of any environmental development constraints.
- Include, where appropriate recreation facilities which are physically, functionally, and visually related to, and serving the urban area.

3.3 Subsequent to carrying out the first stage of the review, using the above methodology as a guideline, a second consideration was to consider the location of appropriate settlement boundaries in relationship to the delivery of the LDP Strategy.

Stage 2 – Focussed Amendments

3.4 This second stage has required interpretation of the LDP Regeneration-Led Spatial Strategy and the implications on areas and settlements of the County Borough – broadly based on the impact of spatial distribution of growth set out in Table 1 of this report.

3.5 For the purposes of this second stage, the following view was undertaken:-

- Selected settlements in the Ogmore and Garw Valley have been considered more flexibly.

The LDP Strategy recognises that large scale growth cannot be delivered in the Ogmore and Garw Valleys because of a combination of constraints relating to market deliverability and topographical issues. However, the LDP Strategy encourages sustainable growth here to stem decline and maintain viable communities in accordance with the area based regeneration aims for these areas (via the VARPs) but without compromising the landscape, which is seen as a key regeneration driver in terms of encouraging tourism.

- The settlement boundary relating to the settlements of Maesteg and the Upper Llynfi Valley have been considered more flexibly.

The LDP Strategy defines this area for growth, but recognises that there are issues of deliverability and topographical constraints. As such a more flexible approach is applied but which does not undermine the delivery of key regeneration sites or the landscape. This will assist in sustaining the role and function of Maesteg as a main settlement, stem decline and maintain viable communities.

- The Valley's Gateway settlements have been considered more flexibly.

The LDP Strategy defines this area for growth – providing an important function in terms of serving the more constrained Ogmore and Garw Valleys, providing more immediate opportunities that are more sustainably located to them than those in the south of the County Borough at Bridgend, Porthcawl, Pencoed and/or the Pyle/Kenfig Cornelly Area.

- Bridgend and Porthcawl are defined as areas of growth – but which can predominantly be served within existing settlement boundaries. Settlement boundaries have not been defined more flexibly.

A more flexible approach to defining settlement boundaries around these settlements would mean the inclusion of greenfield sites that could be 'cherry-picked' by developers and undermine the delivery of key regeneration sites within the settlements that are crucial for the success of the Plan.

- Pencoed and settlements within the Pyle/Kenfig/Cornelly area have not been defined more flexibly. These areas are not defined as areas of growth.

Furthermore a more flexible approach to defining settlement boundaries here would similarly frustrate the implementation of the LDP Strategy by potentially releasing easily developed greenfield sites that could be 'cherry-picked' by developers. Furthermore, Pencoed has significant constraints in terms of flooding and highway capacity issues relating to the existence of a level crossing.

4. Relationship with Candidate Sites

- 4.1 It should be noted that the Candidate Site methodology (see Candidate Site Assessment Report) automatically excludes from its assessment sites less than 0.3ha
- 4.2 This threshold of 0.3ha is considered appropriate, given that for the purposes of residential development it represents a site that would be large enough to accommodate 10 dwellings, and therefore a 'potential' allocation in the LDP.
- 4.3 The Settlement Boundary Review Assessment methodology has therefore been used to consider whether the County Borough's settlement boundaries should be amended to accommodate these 'small-scale' Candidate Sites.
- 4.4 Appendix 1 to this report details the Candidate Sites that have been considered within the context of the settlement boundary review methodology and provides a recommendation as to whether or not the site should be included on excluded from the defined settlement boundaries of the LDP.
- 4.5 In addition, a number of candidate sites that are larger than 0.3ha (and considered as part of the Candidate Site Assessment process) have been identified which did not 'qualify' as a specific allocation in the Plan, but nevertheless represent appropriate amendments to the settlement boundary, satisfying the methodology. These are included in Appendix 2.

5. Results

- 5.1 The results of the review are reflected on the proposals map of the Deposit LDP.

6. Implications for the LDP

- 6.1 In light of the newly defined settlement boundaries, the Council has developed policies which protect the uses beyond them which will now constitute 'the countryside' of the County Borough.

6.2 These policies will be accompanied by additional Supplementary Planning Guidance where appropriate to deal with specific issues such as development design in the countryside.

7. Monitoring and Review

7.1 The LDP will be subject to a four year review to ensure that all of the Policies within it are up-to-date and remain consistent with respect of the decision-making process. In light of this, and relevant existing and emerging guidance, the success of the settlement boundary policy will be monitored to assess the relative 'strength' of the settlement boundaries and where any further amendments maybe necessary.

APPENDIX 1: CANDIDATE SITES UNDER 0.3 HECTARES

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
809.B1	203	Llangorse Isha, Rhiwceiliog, Heol Y Cyw	The LDP Strategy does not identify Pencoed as a location for strategic growth with development located within the existing settlement boundary. This Candidate Site is demonstrably separated from the existing settlement of Pencoed and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Pencoed.
822.B1	169	Simonstone Workshop, Simonstone, Coity, Bridgend, CF35 6BE.	The LDP Strategy identifies Bridgend as a location for strategic growth with development located within the existing settlement boundary. This Candidate Site is demonstrably separated from the existing settlement of Bridgend and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Bridgend.
735.B1	232	Brithdir, Maesteg	The LDP Strategy identifies Maesteg as a location for strategic growth and allows for amendments to the settlement boundary. However, this Candidate Site is demonstrably

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			separated from the existing settlement of Maesteg and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Maesteg.
736.B1	233	Brithdir, Maesteg	The LDP Strategy identifies Maesteg as a location for strategic growth and allows for amendments to the settlement boundary However, this Candidate Site is demonstrably separated from the existing settlement of Maesteg and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Maesteg.
185.B1	280	Land adjoining 1 Moira Terrace, Ogmores Vale, Bridgend.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Ogmores Vale as a location for strategic growth with development focussed within the existing settlement however it does allow for minor amendments to the settlement boundary. This Candidate Site is located within a larger area recognised as forming a logical extension to the settlement boundary and is recommended

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Ogmore Vale.
712.B1	160	Garden of Swn-Y-Mor. Heol Goedog, Cefn Cribbwr, Bridgend, CF32 0AN.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Cefn Cribbwr as a location for strategic growth with development located within the existing settlement boundary. However, this Candidate Site is located within a larger area recognised as an area which is physically and functionally related to the urban area and is recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Cefn Cribbwr.
769.B1	305	Land adjacent to 12 Ballarat, Pencoed, Bridgend, CF35 6LY.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Pencoed as a location for strategic growth with development located within the existing settlement boundary. This Candidate Site is demonstrably separated from the existing settlement of Pencoed and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Pencoed.
771.B1	200	Rear of 64 / 66 / 68 / 70 Pant Hirwaun. Heol-Y-Cyw, Bridgend.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Heol Y Cyw as a location for strategic growth with

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			development located within the existing settlement boundary. However, this Candidate Site was considered to reflect the logical extent to the settlement boundary and is recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Heol Y Cyw.
592.B2	197	Land Off Ffordd Rhaglan, Heol Y Cyw (Former Bryn Chwith Colliery Site).	The LDP Strategy does not identify Heol Y Cyw as a location for strategic growth with development located within the existing settlement boundary. This Candidate Site does not relate physically, functionally or visibly to the existing settlement of Heol y Cyw and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Heol Y Cyw.
768.B1	285	Fronwen Farm - Off Fairy Glen, Ogmores Vale, CF32 7HA.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Ogmores Vale as a location for strategic growth with development focussed within the existing settlement however it does allow for minor amendments to the settlement boundary. Notwithstanding the above, this Candidate Site represents an area of

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			land that does not relate visually with the settlement, having a character more in common with the adjacent mountainside. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Ogmore Vale.
180.B1	158	Laleston Road, Cefn Cross, Cefn Cribbwr, CF32 0EU.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Cefn Cribbwr as a location for strategic growth with development located within the existing settlement boundary. This Candidate Site is demonstrably separate from the existing settlement of Cefn Cribbwr and would create an unsatisfactory linear form into the surrounding countryside and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Cefn Cribbwr.
11.B1	1	Land at Pandy Park Road, Aberkenfig, Bridgend.	The LDP Strategy identifies Aberkenfig as a location for strategic growth and allows for amendments to the settlement boundary. However, this Candidate Site represents an illogical extension to the existing settlement of

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			Aberkenfig/Sarn which is clearly defined in this location by the railway line and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Aberkenfig.
714.B1	7	42 Park Road. Aberkenfig, Bridgend, CF32 9AR.	The LDP Strategy identifies Aberkenfig as a location for strategic growth and allows for amendments to the settlement boundary. However, this Candidate Site represents an illogical extension to the existing settlement of Aberkenfig on land that has more in character with the adjacent countryside than the urban area and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Aberkenfig.
858.B1	167	Central Cottage, Bankers Hill, Cwm Ffoes, Cefn Cribbwr, Bridgend, CF32 0DA.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Cefn Cribbwr as a location for strategic growth with development located within the existing settlement boundary. This Candidate Site is demonstrably separated from the existing settlement of Cefn Cribbwr and

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Cefn Cribbwr.
857.B40	384	Heol Y Nant, Sarn - Former playground.	The LDP Strategy identifies Sarn as a location for strategic growth and allows for amendments to the settlement boundary. This Candidate Site was considered to reflect the logical extent to the settlement boundary in this location and is recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Sarn.
75.B1	23	Adjacent Ebenezer Terrace, Blackmill.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Blackmill as a location for strategic growth with development focussed within the existing settlement boundary, but with minor amendments allowed. However, part of this Candidate Site was considered to relate physically, functionally and visually with the urban area to the settlement boundary and is recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Blackmill.
750.B1	17	Land opposite Bryn Bach Cottages, Bettws.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Bettws as a location for strategic growth

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			with development located within the existing settlement boundary. This Candidate Site represents an inappropriate extension to the existing settlement of Bettws into the open countryside and is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Bettws.
843.B1	290	Land at Elm Terrace, Ogmores Vale.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Ogmores Vale as a location for strategic growth with development focussed within the existing settlement however it does allow for minor amendments to the settlement boundary. Notwithstanding the above, this Candidate Site represents an extension to the existing settlement of Ogmores Vale which would impact upon the landscape which is defined as a Special Landscape Area (SLA) and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Ogmores Vale.
775.B1	323	Land adjacent to Angelton Green, Penyfai.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Penyfai as a location for strategic growth with development

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			<p>located within the existing settlement boundary. Besides a very small portion which did form a logical extension on the basis of being part of a residential curtilage, the vast majority of this Candidate Site represents an inappropriate extension to the existing settlement of Penyfai into the open countryside and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Penyfai.</p>
768.B2	286	Land behind the Old Fronwen School. Adare Street, Wyndham.	<p>The LDP Strategy does not identify Ogmore Vale as a location for strategic growth with development focussed within the existing settlement however it does allow for minor amendments to the settlement boundary. Notwithstanding the above, besides a very small portion which did form a logical extension, the vast majority of this Candidate Site represents an inappropriate extension to the existing settlement of Ogmore Vale into the open countryside and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for</p>

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Ogmere Vale.
823.B1	327	Land adjoining "Ashfield", All Saints Way, Penyfai.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Penyfai as a location for strategic growth with development located within the existing settlement boundary. However, this Candidate Site was considered to reflect a logical extension to the urban area, having characteristics more in common with the existing settlement than the open countryside and is recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Penyfai.
774.B1	262	Llysgwyn Residential Home and land attached, Mawdlam	The LDP Strategy does not identify Mawdlam as a location for strategic growth with development located within the existing settlement boundary. This Candidate Site represents an inappropriate extension to the existing settlement of Mawdlam into the open countryside and does not accord with the LDP Strategy. This site is not recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Mawdlam.
620.B1	25	Land to rear of Ifor Terrace / Glen View, Blackmill.	The LDP Strategy does not identify

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			<p>Blackmill as a location for strategic growth with development focussed within the existing settlement boundary but with minor amendments allowed. This Candidate Site is located within a larger area recognised as forming an appropriate and logical extension to the settlement boundary and is recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Blackmill.</p>
118.B1	340	Areas within the UDP – Pontycymmer Ward	<p>The LDP Strategy does not identify Pontycymmer as a location for strategic growth with development focussed within the existing settlement however it does allow for minor amendments to the settlement boundary. The entire settlement boundary of Pontycymmer was analysed as part of the settlement boundary review and amended where it was in accord with the LDP Strategy.</p>

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
76.B2	46	Whole of Bleangarw Ward	The LDP Strategy does not identify Bleangarw as a location for strategic growth with development focussed within the existing settlement however it does allow for minor amendments to the settlement boundary. The entire settlement boundary of Bleangarw was analysed as part of the settlement boundary review and amended where it was in accord with the LDP Strategy.
857.B27	250	Maesteg Washery	The LDP Strategy identifies Maesteg as a location for strategic growth and allows for amendments to the settlement boundary. Part of this Candidate Site was considered to reflect a logical amendment to the settlement boundary which is recommended as the defined settlement boundary of Maesteg.
857.B6	51	Garages etc... Rear of Victoria Avenue, Blaengarw.	The LDP Strategy does not identify Bleangarw as a location for strategic growth with development focussed within the existing settlement however it does allow for minor amendments to the settlement boundary. This Candidate Site represents an

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Conclusion
			appropriate extension to the existing settlement of Bleangarw into the countryside and accords with the LDP Strategy. This site is recommended for inclusion within the defined settlement boundary of Bleangarw.

**APPENDIX 2: CANDIDATE SITES (OVER 0.3 HECTARES)
RECOGNISED THROUGH SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY REVIEW
AND ASSESSED ACCORDING TO THE CANDIDATE SITE
ASSESSMENT**

Candidate Site Reference	Page no. in Candidate Site Register	Location of Site	Proposed Use
48.B5	277	Adjacent A4061 – Cemetery Road, Ogmore Vale	None – Maintain allotment & pony grazing area
185.B2	280	Land west of Cardiff Street, Hill Street and Cuthbert Street, Ogmore Vale	Residential
614.B1	69	Land at Sunnybank, Cefn Glas Road, Bridgend.	Dwellings and residential curtilage.
716.B1	136	Land at Rear of Maesgwyn House. Blackmill Road, Bryncethin, Bridgend.	Residential
752.B1	137	Land at Rear of Maesgwyn House. Blackmill Road, Bryncethin, Bridgend.	Residential garden.
782.B1	287	Land east of Cemetery Road, Ogmore Vale, Bridgend	Housing
802.B4	193	Coronation Works, Evanstown	Regeneration Site
810.B1	288	Land at Tynewydd Farm, West of North Road	Residential
783.B1	242	Cae Gymrig, Maesteg.	Housing / Recreation
840.B1	139	Craigmoor, Bryncethin, Bridgend	Residential
841.B1	50	Land to south of Darren Bungalow, Garreg Side, Bleangarw	Housing
857.B14	224	Llangeinor Pool and recreation ground, Llangeinor	Residential, recreation and / or employment (change settlement boundary).
857.B18	401	Land rear of Tondu Primary School, Park Road, Aberkenfig	Residential and Education
857.B23	330	Hill Crest, Penyfai.	Residential and recreation.
857.B51	259	Land adjoining Maesteg Hospital	Residential and Health (extend settlement boundary)
798.B1	80	Parc Farm Buildings & Associated Land, Parc Derwen, Bridgend	Inclusion within Parc Derwen housing allocation.