

Application Number: DM/2018/02066

Proposal: Outline application for the construction of 11 dwellings and associated works

Address: Land adjacent to Clearview Court, Shirenewton

Applicant: Mr David Adams

Plans: Location Plan PL 212 A - , Site Plan PL 210 Rev J - ,

RECOMMENDATION:

Case Officer: Mr Craig O'Connor
Date Valid: 21.12.2018

This application is presented to Planning Committee due to the number of objections received

1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

1.0 The site measures 1.62 hectares and lies on the eastern edge of the village of Shirenewton. An access road into Shirenewton runs parallel to the northern boundary and beyond that are modern 2-2.5 storey dwellings. Residential dwellings back onto the western boundary whilst two barn conversions known as Archways and Thistledown Barn are located adjacent to the south-west corner. The eastern side of the site adjoins open countryside.

1.1 The topography is such that the land rises up from the north-west corner to the south-east.

1.2 Outline planning permission is sought for 11 dwellings within the red line boundary. All matters are reserved for future consideration with the exception of access. Whilst the submitted details include a site layout it is important to remember that this layout is indicative only at this stage and that such matters would be considered at reserved matters stage if this outline application were to be approved.

1.3 The site is made up of three parcels of land; the area to the west benefits from an extant reserved matters application for 7 houses (ref DC/2014/01185). The majority of the land to the east is a site allocated within the Local Development Plan (LDP) ref SAH11(xiv)(a) for approximately 5 dwellings. Land to the south and a strip of land to the east is unallocated. The indicative site layout illustrates this as being garden land with no built development. The unallocated land to the south is approximately 20m deep and 40m wide whilst the strip to the east is 7m wide at its widest point, tapering down to 4m wide at the northern boundary.

1.4 An existing private access track runs through the site from north to south, providing access to both Archways and Thistledown Barn. It is understood from the agent that due to legal covenants on the track in relation to rights of access, no physical changes can be made to amend the alignment of the access and track. For clarity, the land on which the track is situated is owned by the applicant, but the occupiers of Archways and Thistledown Barn have rights of access.

1.5 A new second access off the minor road (to the north) is proposed with turning head.

1.6 An illustrative site layout plan has been submitted to demonstrate how 11 dwellings could be accommodated on the site. This includes the provision of four affordable housing units. The layout would be subject to negotiation at a later stage if the principle is considered acceptable.

1.7 Details submitted with the application indicate that surface water will be disposed of via soakaways and foul water via the existing public sewerage network.

1.8 For outline applications the minimum and maximum length, width and height of dwellings is required. These are referred to as 'scale parameters'. The scale parameters proposed are as follows:

1.8.1 Plots 1-3: 12.5m-13.5m long x 9m-12.5m wide with a height of between 8.4m-8.6m to ridge (5.2m-5.4m to eaves). These would be two storey in height.

1.8.2 Plots 4-7: 12.5m-13.5m long x 9m-12.5m wide with a height of between 8.4m-8.9m to ridge (5.2m-5.4m to eaves). These would be 2-2.5 storey in height (for clarity, a 2.5 storey dwelling would essentially be a two storey dwelling with rooms in the attic, so usually feature dormer windows). In this case, the eaves height would be the same as the two storey dwellings, but the ridge height would be 0.3m higher at ridge height.

1.8.3 Plots 8-11: 4m-5.2m long x 9m-10.5m wide with a height of 8.4m-8.9m to ridge (5m-5.2m to eaves). These would be two storey in height.

1.9 The application pre-dates the newly introduced SAB approval regime and is therefore not subject to such requirements. However, if approved, the applicant would be required to submit a Reserved Matters application by January 2020. Failure to do so would mean the development would be subject to SAB approval.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (if any)

Reference Number	Description	Decision	Decision Date
DM/2018/01813	Non material amendment to DC/2009/01061 to remove conditions 6, 7 and 8 relating to code for sustainable homes.	Approved	15.11.2018
DM/2018/01814	Amendments to conditions 9 and 10 from previous application DC/2014/01185.	Approved	15.11.2018
DM/2018/01817	Discharge of condition 5 (GI) from previous application DC/2014/01185 - Landscape Management Plan	Refused	21.12.2018
DM/2018/01844	Discharge of conditions 3 (Highways Engineering Details), 10 (Levels) and 11 (Drainage Details) in relation to DC/2009/01061	Refused	21.12.2018
DM/2018/01846	Discharge of conditions 6 (Highways Agreement), 7 (Highways Surface Water Management Scheme), 9 (Estate Street Phasing and Completion Plan) and 10 (Highways Management and Maintenance Plan) in relation to DC/2014/01185.	Refused	21.12.2018

DM/2018/02062	Non-material amendment to previous application DC/2009/01061 - conditions 3, 10 and 11.	Approved	21.12.2018
DM/2018/02063	Non-material amendment to previous application dc/2014/01185 - conditions 2,3,5,6 and 7.	Approved	21.12.2018
DC/2009/01061	Residential development (outline)	Approved	26.10.2011
DC/2014/01488	Removal of conditions 6,7 and 8 relating to Code for Sustainable Homes under DC/2009/01061	Approved	17.12.2014
DC/2014/01185	Reserved matters application for 7no. dwellings and associated works on land adjoining Clearview Court granted outline permission under application DC/2009/01061, including details to discharge condition 1 (Reserved Matters) and condition 4 (Boundary Treatments).	Approved	10.01.2017

3.0 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Strategic Policies

S1 LDP The Spatial Distribution of New Housing Provision
S4 LDP Affordable Housing Provision
S13 LDP Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment
S16 LDP Transport
S17 LDP Place Making and Design
SAH11 LDP Main Villages

Development Management Policies

H2 LDP Residential Development in Main Villages
NE1 LDP Nature Conservation and Development
DES1 LDP General Design Considerations
EP1 LDP Amenity and Environmental Protection
MV1 LDP Proposed Developments and Highway Considerations

4.0 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

Planning Policy Wales (PPW) Edition 10

The primary objective of PPW is to ensure that the planning system contributes towards the delivery of sustainable development and improves the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being as required by the Planning (Wales) Act 2015, the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and other key legislation. A well-functioning planning system is fundamental for sustainable development and achieving sustainable places.

The planning system should create sustainable places which are attractive, sociable, accessible, active, secure, welcoming, healthy and friendly. Development proposals should create the conditions to bring people together, making them want to live, work and play in areas with a sense of place and well-being, creating prosperity for all.

5.0 REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 Consultation Replies

Shirenewton Community Council - Following the meeting on 21st March, Council felt that its original concerns around sewerage, soak-aways, layout of the houses and visitor parking have been answered. However the Community Council has only had verbal assurance that the houses in plots 4, 5 and 6 will not be allowed to build anything in areas of their gardens which is outside the LDP this Council would like to understand and also have written confirmation from Monmouthshire CC on how it is proposed to restrict these property owners (and future owners) from future builds and sheds.

The materials and quality of finishes on the properties have not yet been approved by Monmouthshire CC; this Council understands that is the next stage in the process and would like to ensure that the decision taken will be sympathetic and complement the houses on the other side of the road. Likewise, it was discussed at the meeting in Usk that there would be no tall street lighting, but diffused lighting from bollards. Council would like to see that confirmed.

County Councillor Brown raised relocation of the 30mph speed sign further back along the road entering from Mounton with Highways; request that it be confirmed that the signage will be relocated.

Original Comments:

- Concerned about proposed sewerage connection to public system. The system is known to overflow. Also known problem of overcapacity on the line from Shirenewton to Pwllmeyric.
- Proposed pipework for surface water drainage needs to be examined as unrecorded beyond no.7 Clearview
- Protrusion of gardens x, y and z into farmland beyond LDP envelope is a loss of that farmland and carried the expectation that, as garden land, it will nevertheless be built upon by householders.
- Inadequate parking provision for visitors to affordable housing and communal parking area at least should be provided
- The Design Statement appears to suggest there is a bus link to Caerwent which is not correct. Bus service also been counted in both directions - there are only 3 buses to and from Chepstow every working day and one less on Saturdays
- Transport statement underestimates the number of vehicle journeys given that families have at least two cars due to lack of public transport and need to travel outside the village for shopping, medical and school facilities

Planning Policy - No objection.

Part of the site is located within the village development boundary, part is located within the LDP Main Village SAH11(xiv)(a) allocation - Land to east of Shirenewton (south of minor road) and the remainder is located within the open countryside. It is noted that the part of the proposed site located within the development boundary has an extant permission for 7 units, 6 market and 1 affordable determined under UDP policies.

With regard to the area within the SAH11(xiv)(a) allocation, the development of this part of the site complies with LDP policies S1 and H1 in principle, subject to detailed planning considerations. In order to comply with LDP policies S4 and SAH11, 3 out of the 5 units are required to be affordable.

With regard to the area within the Shirenewton Development Boundary (outside SAH11(xiv)(a) allocation), the development of this part of the site meets the requirements of Strategic Policy S1 and Policy H1 in principle, subject to detailed planning considerations.

Strategic Policy S4 relating to the provision of affordable housing is of relevance, it states that in Main Villages there is a requirement for at least 60% of the total number of dwellings to be affordable. The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance was adopted in March 2016 and should also be referred to. The Affordable Housing SPG (Section 4.4.C.2) does allow for some relaxation of the 60% requirement on sites in Main Villages that are not specifically allocated

for housing under Policy SAH11, taking into consideration the provisions of Policy DES1 criterion I).

Strictly speaking in accordance with paragraph 6.1.1 of the Affordable Housing SPG as this relates to a new application the part of the site within the development boundary should be providing a minimum of 35% affordable units. It is noted, however, that there is an extant planning permission on this part of the site and as such it would not be considered an issue to utilise the overall area of the site to provide a mixture of market and affordable units, provided at least 4 units are affordable out of the total of 11 units. Any increase above 12 units across the site, however, would result in additional affordable housing requirement. The affordable housing requirement should also be reassessed if the whole of the site is not utilised or the site is phased in any way, to ensure there is no deliberate attempt to avoid the provision of affordable housing.

With regard to the part of the site located outside of the Shirenewton Development Boundary into an area considered as open countryside, this minor encroachment into the surrounding countryside is deemed acceptable provided that it is utilised for amenity space or gardens and is not used to extend the area of the built form.

Other LDP policies would also need to be considered including S13, S17, DES1, EP1, GI1, NE1 and MV1.

MCC Ecology - No objection subject to conditions.

MCC Landscape and Urban Design - No objection subject to conditions:

The proposal seeks to develop a greenfield site within the defined urban edge of Shirenewton with 7no. two-storey and 4no. 2-2.5 storey houses with associated parking, access, garages, gardens and landscape boundary treatments. The site seeks to share the use of an access driveway to Thistledown Barn by agreement as well as creating a new access to serve plots 4-11.

The provision of a new access seeks to remove a well-established boundary hedge that forms part of the landscape character of the lane approach to Shirenewton from the east to accommodate a new footway on the edge of the highway.

The main areas of concern and information still required:

- o Due to the high LANDMAP aspect values and the elevated open position of the site an LVIA will be required in order to assess the impact the development and rooflines will have on important local receptors, the wider landscape and potentially on the nearby registered Grade 2 listed park of Shirenewton hall. The LVIA should be undertaken to the 'Guidelines for landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' 3rd Edition. Further assessment is required to address Policy LC5. To adequately demonstrate this baseline information and assess the impact against the criteria set out in policy LC5 the assessment will require supporting views and photographs

- o The general layout of the properties needs to be revisited to improve the use of space within the site for access, plots, garages and gardens, to improve the relationship between frontages and access, the relationship between properties, boundaries and wider GI networks. To also provide space for landscape and habitat mitigation within a potential SuDS scheme as appropriate.

Currently the outline density, layout and frontage would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the village form, character and surrounding landscape.

- o There is concern that the proposed development has not adequately assessed the GI assets and opportunities effectively. A GI assets and opportunities plan needs to be provided to inform a GI masterplan for the site, landscape plan and a GI Management plan

- o The proposal indicates four dwellings 8-11 as a terrace which would be out of character as part of the urban edge of Shirenewton and in the context of the existing built edge and opposite development. Any development fronting the main road needs to be set back to ensure the integrity of the hedge is retained and the boundary edge can be managed appropriately.

- o The proposal indicates the removal of a species rich hedge to the north to provide a 2nd access to plots 4-11 and footway linking to the village. The boundary hedge to the north of the site provides a range of ecosystem services and needs to be protected in situ and managed accordingly to ensure the integrity of the lane and visual approach to Shirenewton is maintained.

The removal can be avoided by using the existing or modifying the existing access point to highways approval and providing a change to the plot layouts. This would preserve the majority of

the hedge, remove the need for a footway which would then be internal linking to dwellings and preserve elements of the rural lane approach to the urban edge of Shirenewton.

There is scope for suitable development on the site however, the submission of a more appropriate scheme and layout informed by appropriate LVIA and GI assessments would be required. Suggest conditions to be attached to any permission and require the submission of details with reserved matters.

Aneurin Bevan Health Board - One response has been received from Mount Pleasant GP practice in Chepstow regarding this application, as follows:

The practice has applied for development of the Portskewett Branch surgery, and are concerned about capacity at the main surgery in Chepstow pending that development, as there is no room for further staff to be sited.

Cadw - No objections to the impact of the proposed development on the scheduled monuments or registered historic parks and gardens.

GGAT - No objection.

Dwr Cymru Welsh Water - No objection.

Confirmed that they would accept foul water only flows from the site. From reviewing the submission, we note the applicant is proposing to discharge surface water through the use of SuDS and a soakaway. We are satisfied with these drainage proposals on the basis no surface water will directly or indirectly discharge into the public sewerage system. There is a public sewer running through the site. No operational development will be permitted 3m either side of the public sewer.

MCC Highways Officer – Object to the application based on the existing access that would serve three private dwellings being unsatisfactory.

Eastern Access (8 dwellings)

The proposed access is shown by a typical 'no through' residential estate access road with turning provision and access onto the adjacent county unclassified highway C61-1 in the form of a typical T junction. A footway is shown within the site and on the site frontage to provide suitable pedestrian connectivity beyond the site. Visibility splays from the junction are shown to be 2.4m x 37m to the east and 2.4m x 41m to the west. A 5 day ATC traffic speed survey data was carried out and the results are submitted in the Transport Statement which demonstrates an average speed of 21.3mph for vehicles travelling westbound and an average speed of 22.2mph eastbound. The proposed visibility splays therefore satisfy the requirements standards contained within Manual for Streets. The proposed car parking provision for each unit has been satisfactorily designed in accordance with the Monmouthshire Parking Standards. Generally the proposed access and estate road has been designed in accordance with current design practices and would appear to be designed to an adoptable standard. However, there are concerns as to whether the turning head has been designed to accommodate the turning movements of a refuse vehicle. A swept path analysis has been submitted which shows the turning movements of a refuse vehicle however this only relates to movements at the junction. We would therefore request that a swept path analysis be submitted for the proposed turning head.

Existing Access (3 new dwellings plus 2 existing dwellings)

Despite achieving an acceptable means of access under application DC/2014/01185 it is noted that the access layout has reverted to the existing access arrangement to facilitate access for the 3 new and 2 existing dwellings. It should be noted that regardless of the number of additional dwellings proposed from the existing access we would expect appropriate improvements to provide a satisfactory means of access in accordance with current design standards. The existing access is unacceptable to serve the development on the grounds that it is of inappropriate size and orientation which is contrary to current design standards and highway safety requirements. We would therefore object to the access proposal on these grounds.

Active Travel

The TS states that access will be provided for pedestrians and cyclists. A link footway is to be provided along the eastern edge of the existing access and on both sides of the eastern access. Furthermore, a footway link between the two access roads will be provided. Whilst the TS makes reference to these links it is not represented on drawing '1876 PL-210 Rev. H' submitted with the application. In light of this revised drawing '1876 PL-210 Rev. J' has now been submitted which indicates the pedestrian link along the site frontage however is only shown to have a width of 1.8m which falls short of the standard width of 2m. It should be noted that the site link footway between the two access roads is still not shown.

Existing 30mph Traffic Regulation Order

The Highway Authority wish to acknowledge the local community's request for an extension to the existing 30mph speed limit traffic regulation order. However, having consulted with the Highway Authority's Traffic Engineers, there is no requirement for an extension to the 30mph speed limit as the proposed development is satisfactorily positioned within the existing 30mph speed limit. Furthermore, the 5 day ATC vehicle speed survey demonstrates that the average speed of vehicles travelling along the C61-1 westbound is 21.3mph and 22.2mph eastbound. Based on this there is no justification or requirement for an extension to the existing 30mph speed limit.

SEWBRc Search Results - No significant ecological record identified. (delete / edit as appropriate)

5.2 Neighbour Notification

Six Letters of objection have been received and one letter of observation. The main issues raised are summarised as follows:

- Confusion over number of dwellings as seven already received approval and waiting for works to commence
- under the impression that the adjacent plot was part of the adopted local development plan, so would happen in the future, as part of a gradual development.
- Plot seems considerably larger than the size in the LDP.
- Accompanying documents appear to be cut and paste - transport document refers to Tan House Pub as an amenity but has been derelict for many years.
- The existing track is gravel, and requires weekly maintenance due to vehicle movement and water run off. More vehicles (between six and fourteen depending on scheme) will greatly add to the burden.
- The new application completely ignores decisions by Monmouthshire Council regarding ridge height, layout and density of development.
- Surely a completely different application with a near 60% increase in dwellings, an additional plot, and an additional access should be considered a new application. It would appear that changes to original conditions are being sought and agreed whilst the new application has been submitted.
- Concerned 4-year-old son will have to walk through a building site to go to and from school.
- Access to my property is and will be required at all times.
- The level change at the bottom of the site compared to the road is approximately 2 metres. This is a huge change of level which will require an enormous amount of excavation to allow the access as proposed and the visual splay.
- There is a mature ancient hedge at the northern boundary which will have to be removed, causing severe reduction in habitat for flora and fauna.
- The proposals for surface water are totally unworkable. There is a spring marked on the map at the southern - uphill - end of the site, the site is waterlogged most of the year as a grass field.
- The existing gravel track leading to the two barn conversions at the top of the site turns into a stream during persistent rainfall. More hard surfaces and roof run off will create huge amounts of surface water.
- Development of this scale is inappropriate for a village of the size of Shirenewton.
- The increased traffic from 11 houses - at least 22, if not more vehicles, will create a large problem, especially on the bend of Sprout Hill.

- Discrepancies on the application form regarding diversions of Rights of Way - The applicant is well aware of the easement relating to access to the properties "Archways" and "Thistledown Barn". Also form incorrect in relation to hedges.
- Additional traffic flows onto the public highway at a junction already blind, turning and sloping, and prone to flooding and freezing in the winter. The same issues apply to the proposed new access at the north-east part of the site, which is blind at the point of egress from the site despite a suggested vision splay.
- Concern over 30mph speed limit - many cars being well inside the 30mph area before they decelerate at all, let alone to 30mph.
- Lack of a turning head ("hammerhead") at the southern end of the drive is already well established through previous outline and reserved matters.
- Heavy rain has often drained off the applicant's field onto the access track leading to localised flooding on the junction of the lane at the junction with Spout Hill
- Ridge Heights have been queried because all previous outline and reserved matters approvals have recognised that the scale and massing of 2 & 2.5 storey height plots to the southern and western sides of the site significantly affect views of the approach to village from the east.
- There will be a significant degree of shadowing and overlooking into Archways from the plot nearest to the southern boundary
- It is disappointing to have to repeat contentions on poor design and compliance considerations on this fifth iteration of the proposed development
- I think the encroachment is a little more than minor; I would say the encroachment is about 30% more than the Site Reference: SAH11(xiv)(a) Site Description: Land to east of Shirenewton (south of minor road).
- It seems pointless publishing plots of land for Local development planning when the land owner is able to increase the plot size by over 30%.
- The value of the land between agricultural green field and building plot is considerably more than 30% I suspect.
- Concerns around the scale and density and impact upon increasing road traffic at this narrow junction with limited visibility; increasing surface water drainage by urbanising the sloping site, raising the risk of flooding on the road; the loss of longstanding, species-rich hedgerow from the location which, in the last five years, has already lost significant stretches of similar hedgerow.
- The additional properties proposed will add greater pressure to the sewage network which is already at overcapacity.
- The extra houses will add to the significant pressure on parking and traffic movements around this junction.
- The site plan that is shown on the application is incorrect, in that it shows our house (number 8 Clearview) before it was extended in 2013.
- The new plans for further housing accessing onto a small county lane, will only put further pressure onto a small village and affect the sight line from my property.
- Amazed by the allocation of parking spaces to rear of affordable units providing no access to front doors.
- No provision for visitor parking on the plans
- Close to adjoining properties
- Development too high
- General dislike of proposal
- Loss of privacy
- More open space needed on development
- Appalled that the plans now include eleven dwellings on such a small plot of land so close to the village border; this is not in keeping with the character of the village.
- The local school is currently oversubscribed as previously determined and commented on by our own council; the introduction of family homes into a small village is detrimental to current local children's school places, it is my understanding that proposed residential dwellings should serve to enhance local communities not overwhelm them.
- The separation of the affordable units into two pairs of semi-detached units will be even closer to the road than before and will affect the vision splays.
- Continuing theme of trying to squeeze a quart into a pint pot.
- We note that the layout plan recognises our existing right of access and we also note the layout of plots 1 and 2 and the garages therein.

5.3 Local Member Representations

Cllr L Brown requested that the application be referred to the Planning Committee for full consideration, as it raises a number of concerns including the scale and size of the development and suitability in this particular location.

The following concerns raised are summarised as follows:

- Beyond LDP Envelope into agricultural Land:
- Parking - inappropriate tandem manner and there is a need for visitor parking here. Parking for the private houses should also be marked out for three spaces each as more than half of garages are used for storage.
- Design, materials, sizes and height of dwellings -Setting out of the plots need to reflect the design, use of materials, sizes and dwellings in relation to the street scene opposite.
- The site slopes upwards with a height difference between the land and the road, so it is important to consider the heights of the properties being proposed for all the plots and dwellings and the different height levels relative to the neighbouring properties including both properties next to the site and those across the road. The height of a neighbouring property is only 1.5 storeys. Reports in this application mention certain units being up to 2.5 storeys and that height would be out of keeping with the local area and neighbouring properties.
- Access - three of the properties will share the grit access with the neighbouring properties and there is not a sufficient turning circle for either construction, waste vehicles or emergency vehicles up this access.
- The safety of any young children accessing the existing neighbouring properties up this grit drive during the construction works of three houses needs to be fully considered particularly if large vehicles are reversing.
- SuDS and Hedging - The mention of a spring on site needs to be fully investigated as no surface water can flow into the sewerage system and springs may alter the capacity of soakaways and the land to absorb surface water. Consideration of SuDS is important and the use of porous material/ gardens for anywhere other than the location of dwellings and garages.
- Sewerage Capacity - Whilst the letter from the water board at the end of January 2019, states that the properties can be connected to the foul sewerage system but no surface water, planning officers are requested to recheck with the water board taking account of comments made here from the local member and from the community council about sewerage capacity
- In this field area, where this main sewerage pipe runs through, the manhole covers have been fenced around due to sewerage seepage.
- GP /Local Health Capacity - In addition the health board report indicates the local GP surgery is not well placed capacity wise to take on extra patients.
- Highway Safety Concerns - There are highway safety concerns in the site area with traffic in this single track narrow road close to the bend and junction. The 30mph boundary originally had a much longer clearer gap and lead into the village from its starting point and moving from a surrounding field rural area into the Shirenewton village sign which was then adjacent to the start of the housing.
- It would be appropriate for consideration be given to highway safety measures such as setting back the 30mph prior to any housing and reducing it to 20mph as Shirenewton village already has advisory 20mph speed limits in some locations. Neighbours already report near misses at this location and junction with Spout Hill and the accident statistics do not record all car damage accidents, only those with personal injuries and also do not record near misses.
- Transport Statement - Over-estimates the bus service by counting each way rather than return journeys and consequently underestimates the use of vehicles due to the lack of public transport and no shopping/medical or secondary school facilities in the village.
- The transport statement is out of date and inaccurate, the map is out of date, even the names of local roads is inaccurate as it refers to Earlswood road as opposed to Spout Hill as the local road. Also the appendix has information on Stanwell Road, Penarth.

6.0 EVALUATION

6.1 Principle of Development and affordable housing

6.1.1 Shirenewton and Mynyddbach has been identified under Policy S1 of the LDP as being a Main Village, within which small scale residential development will be allowed. Policy H1 of the LDP permits new built residential development within settlement boundaries subject to detailed planning considerations including that there is no adverse impact upon the village form and character and the surrounding landscape. The eastern section of the site is a housing allocation within the LDP - SAH11(xiv)(a) 'Land to east of Shirenewton (south of minor road)'. The site is required to provide 60% of the total number of dwellings within this area to be affordable housing units.

6.1.2 The application site is predominantly within the Shirenewton village development boundary. The western part of the site already benefits from an extant permission for 7 dwellings (DC/2019/01061) whilst the central/eastern part of the site is an allocated site for up to 5 dwellings ((SAH11(xiv)(a)). A section to the south and a strip along the eastern boundary fall outside of the development boundary but the indicative plans illustrate that no built development is proposed within this land and it would be utilised for garden areas and landscaping.

6.1.3 With the exception of the unallocated land, which is proposed as garden land, the principle of housing development on the site has already been established, given the site is predominantly within the village's development boundary. The inclusion of the unallocated land, which incidentally measures 15m x 54m, allows for a lower density development which would be more characteristic of a village form. The part of the site that is located outside of the Shirenewton Development Boundary is a minor encroachment into the surrounding countryside and is deemed acceptable given it is utilised for amenity space or gardens and is not used to extend the area of the built form. Conditions would be imposed that remove permitted development for outbuildings within these areas.

6.1.4 It is therefore considered that on balance, the principle of development is acceptable and accords with LDP policies H1 and SAH11(xiv)(a).

6.1.5 The development proposes seven private market dwellings and four affordable housing units. There is an extant planning consent (DC/2014/01061) for the eastern part of the site for seven dwellings with one of those dwellings being affordable. This application is a hybrid application which incorporates the area of the previous consent (DC/2014/01061) and the 60/40 allocated site, SAH11(xiv)(a). The applicant has proposed that seven units are private market houses and four units are affordable. On balance, given the previous extant planning consent for seven dwellings it is considered that the amount of affordable housing at the site is acceptable and the proposals would be in accordance with the requirements of Policy S4 to provide affordable housing units in Shirenewton. The Council's Planning Policy Officer has outlined that "it would not be considered an issue to utilise the overall area of the site to provide a mixture of market and affordable units, provided at least 4 units are affordable out of the total of 11 units. Any increase above 12 units across the site, however, would result in additional affordable housing requirement. The affordable housing requirement should also be reassessed if the whole of the site is not utilised or the site is phased in any way, to ensure there is no deliberate attempt to avoid the provision of affordable housing." To ensure that this does not occur, a condition relating to a phasing plan would be added to any consent. The Council's Affordable Housing Officer has reviewed the proposals and supports the proposal and the type of dwellings that are being proposed. The provision of affordable housing at this site is acceptable and does accord with the requirements of Policy S4 of the LDP.

6.1.6 Para 4.2.25 of PPW10 confirms that a community's need for affordable housing is a material consideration which must be taken into account in formulating development plan policies as well as determining relevant planning applications. This reflects the importance of securing appropriate affordable housing provision in Wales. In September 2016, the Welsh Government announced the Programme 'Taking Wales Forward 2016-2021', which includes a commitment to work in partnership to deliver an extra 20,000 affordable homes to 2021. Whilst only a small development,

this application seeks to assist in the provision of affordable housing by providing four affordable dwellings.

6.2 Good Design/ Place making

6.2.1 The application is for outline planning with all matters reserved, with the exception of access. As such, no architectural design details have been submitted. The applicant has submitted an indicative layout that outlines the potential footprint of the proposed dwellings and it demonstrates that appropriately sized and well-designed dwellings could be located at the site. The indicative plans have been amended following discussions with the Local Member and the Community Council to overcome initial concerns they had with the development. It is noted, that there is a mix of architectural styles, scale and form of dwellings in the area. Scale parameters have been specified which allows for a mixture of 2 - 2.5 storey dwellings. It is noted that there are two 2.5 storey dwellings directly north of the site and as such, it is not considered these would be out of context with the character of the area. They would of course need to respect the topography of the site to ensure they are not overbearing to other properties within the site or adjacent properties. Cross sections would be required as part of any future reserved matters application. It is considered that an appropriately designed housing development could be accommodated at the site that would harmonise with the character and appearance of the locality. The proposed development would be in accordance with policies S1, S4, S13, S17, DES1, EP1 and H1 of the LDP.

6.3 Impact on Amenity/ Promoting Healthier Places

6.3.1 The site is located on the edge of the village of Shirenewton, although there are a number of properties in close proximity to the site. The proposed dwellings are not considered to have an unacceptable impact on the privacy or private amenity of the neighbouring properties and would be acceptable. The application is made in outline only and the layout of the proposed development including the positioning of windows on buildings would be considered in detail at the reserved matters stage to ensure the privacy of local residents is protected. The submitted indicative layout does highlight that an appropriate development could be accommodated at the site that would not harm residential amenity. The proposed development would not harm any other party's residential amenity and would be in accordance with Policy EP1 of the LDP.

6.4 Sustainable transport issues (Sustainable Transport Hierarchy)

6.4.1 With regards to local services and facilities, Chepstow Town Centre is located within a 20 minute bus journey of the site. Two existing bus stops are located within 100m of the site boundary along the main road through Shirenewton, providing services between Cwmbran and Chepstow via Pontypool. Further bus stops are located 345m to the west of the site near the junction with Spout Hill and Crick Road. Shirenewton / Mynydd-bach is a relatively sustainable location with associated services and facilities and therefore the construction of additional housing in this location is acceptable. The proposed development also provides a footpath on the rural lane to encourage walking into the village albeit connections to the village are limited. However, as identified in para. 4.1.16 of PPW, different approaches to sustainable transport will be required in different parts of Wales, particularly in rural areas. It is therefore recognised that new development will need to reflect local circumstances and existing infrastructure. The development promotes walking and cycling and there are good transport links to main settlements in close vicinity to the village. It is considered that the siting of housing in this location accords with the requirements of PPW Ed. 10 section 4.1.8 to support sustainable growth.

6.5 Access / Highway Safety

6.5.1 The Council's Highways Officer has provided comments on the proposals and has objected to the applicants using the existing substandard access for three private market dwellings. The Highways Officer objects to utilising the existing access that serves Archways and Thistledown Barn as it is of an inappropriate size and orientation which is contrary to current design standards and highway safety requirements. This is a private access road that is well established and the proposed development only results in an additional three units using this access point.

6.5.2 The majority of the proposed development (8 dwellings) would be accessed off a proposed new access onto the rural highway to the east of the site. This access has been designed to meet current standards and the Highways Officer has no objections to this element of the proposals. The eastern access point has been designed to meet current standards and it would not have a harmful impact on highway safety in accordance with Policy MV1 of the LDP. The proposed development has been amended several times to overcome concerns with deliverability and ensuring an appropriate scheme for the site. Although it is recognised that the existing access is substandard it is not considered to be unacceptable to use this access point for three additional properties. The amount of additional traffic movements that these properties would generate would be limited. The existing access point is well established and on balance, the Local Planning Authority considers that given it would only serve three additional dwellings its use in this development would be acceptable. The presented development provides a deliverable scheme that provides much needed affordable housing to the area. The proposals are considered to have an acceptable impact on highway safety and would be in accordance with the requirements of Policy MV1 of the LDP.

6.6 Landscape/ Visual Impact

6.6.1 This application is for outline planning consent only with the layout, scale and appearance of the development being considered at a later date. Notwithstanding this, the visual impact of the development is considered to be acceptable. The consideration of housing within the development boundary was considered as part of the LDP examination and the development would provide a built form opposite the housing at Mounton Court which would balance the form of this edge of the village. The proposed indicative layout shows an appropriate layout and there is scope for a suitable development to be accommodated at the site that would not harm the character and appearance of the rural landscape.

6.6.2 It is considered that a well-designed housing scheme could be accommodated at the site that has green infrastructure principles and is sympathetic to the site's edge of village setting. The proposals would be in accordance with the requirements of policies S13, S17, DES1, EP1 and LC5 of the LDP and this housing development would have an acceptable visual impact on the wider area.

6.7 Biodiversity

6.7.1 A preliminary ecological assessment was submitted with the application and subject to the suggested conditions the Council's Biodiversity Officer would not object to the proposals. The proposal does include the loss of a significant section of hedgerow, 43m long, to provide vision splay. The hedgerow on site is species rich and is designated as priority habitat but on balance the creation of the safe vehicular access to the site is considered to be acceptable to provide the required housing. The site can accommodate appropriate green infrastructure to mitigate for the loss of the hedgerow with a new hedgerow to be planted to provide suitable habitat along the boundary of the properties. With appropriate mitigation, the development would not have an unacceptable impact on wildlife interests and would be in accordance with Policy NE1 of the LDP.

6.8 Water (including foul drainage / SuDS)

6.8.1 The site has been designed to discharge surface water through the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and a soakaway in accordance with the requirements of Policy SD4 of the LDP. Dwr Cymru Welsh Water have not raised any objections or concerns with regards to foul drainage capacity. Local residents and the Local Member have raised concerns with the condition of the Dwr Cymru-Welsh Water pipework in the area and potential for the assets to cause pollution in the area. This is an existing issue and a matter for Dwr Cymru Welsh Water to resolve rather than being a material planning consideration. There is sewerage capacity to accommodate the additional dwellings and Dwr Cymru-Welsh Water have not objected to the proposals. There is no reason to refuse the development based on drainage grounds.

6.9 Other S106 Contributions

6.9.1 The application is a hybrid application with part of the site to the west being within the application and the allocated 60/40 site to the west. The 60/40 allocated sites are exempt from S106 financial contributions given their priority is to provide a high proportion of affordable housing. On 60/40 sites the issue of viability means they are unable to contribute to other services. As this application is a hybrid it is considered appropriate to request a proportion of S106 contributions in relation to five dwellings. This is on the basis that the two market and three affordable units would be exempt as part of the 60/40 element of the scheme, and the remaining affordable dwelling would also be exempt given that the applicant would be providing this unit. Therefore, the Local Planning Authority would be seeking a contribution of £4,173 per dwelling to carry out improvements at the village play area at Shirenewton playing field and for an off-site recreation contribution.

6.10 Response to the Representations of the Local Member

6.10.1 The site does encroach into the open countryside but as outlined in section 5.1 this is considered to be acceptable and the built form would be contained within the development boundary. Although the application seeks outline planning consent only, the applicant has provided an indicative layout which has been amended to overcome the Community Council's and Local Member's concerns in relation to the type of dwellings, tandem parking and access and turning of vehicles. The detailed design, height and materials of the dwellings would be reviewed at the reserved matters application stage. Although the proposed heights (scale parameters) outlined within the application are considered to be acceptable, the impact in particular on the amenity of neighbouring parties can be reviewed at the reserved matters stage. Section 6.4.7 outlines that the drainage of the site is considered to be acceptable and any concerns relating to the existing drainage infrastructure would be a matter for Dwr Cymru-Welsh Water to address. Dwr Cymru have outlined that there is sewerage capacity for the proposed development. Given the scale of the development, it is not considered that the development would have a significant impact on local health capacity to warrant refusing the application. The site is within the development boundary and allocated for development within the LDP. The designated speed along the highway would be a matter for the Highway Authority, and they have outlined in their comments that there is no requirement for an extension to the 30mph speed limit as the proposed development is satisfactorily positioned within the existing 30mph speed limit.

6.11 Response to the Representations of Third Parties and Community Council

6.11.1 The proposed scheme is a new development and a new application that incorporates elements of the previous consent at the site and the 60/40 element. The built form would be within the development boundary for Shirenewton and the encroachment of garden space into the open countryside is considered acceptable to achieve a more acceptable scheme as outlined in section 5.1 above. The scale of the development would be appropriate and the development would be appropriate for an edge of settlement development. Concerns over the scale and design of any subsequent dwellings would be considered as part of a reserved matters application. The applicants have outlined that surface water would be managed via soakaways and there would be no drainage into the public system. The acceptability of the proposed soakaways would be considered during any subsequent building regulations application. The maintenance of the private road that serves existing properties would be a private matter for the potential future residents and the neighbouring parties. It would not be material planning reason to refuse the application. The visual impact of the new access has been considered and the development would not harm the appearance of the area. The proposed development would not generate a significant amount of additional traffic in the area and is considered to be acceptable. The proposed access arrangements are considered to be acceptable and the development would not have an adverse impact on highway safety. The exact layout of the site would be determined during the reserved matters stage. There is no requirements for additional visitor parking within the site with the road network being able to accommodate visitor parking. The development can be designed to not have a harmful impact on the amenity of local residents.

6.12 Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015

6.12.1 The duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales has been considered, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (the WBFG Act). In reaching this recommendation, the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act have been taken into account and it is considered that this recommendation is in accordance with the sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives set out in section 8 of the WBFG Act.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 In conclusion, it is considered that the development is acceptable. The principle of constructing eleven dwellings within this site is acceptable and the provision of the much-needed affordable dwellings is welcomed. The majority of the site would be served by a new access that would be designed to an acceptable standard whilst utilising the existing access for three additional properties that would not be considered to have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The proposed development would be acceptable in terms of highway safety. The proposal would be in accordance with the relevant policies in the LDP and is recommended for approval subject to a legal agreement (for affordable housing and offsite recreation) and the conditions outlined below.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Subject to a 106 Legal Agreement requiring the following:

Four affordable housing units and a contribution of £4173 per dwelling for five of the properties for offsite recreation.

S106 Heads of Terms

If the S106 Agreement is not signed within 6 months of the Planning Committee's resolution then delegated powers be granted to officers to refuse the application.

Conditions:

1 Approval of the details of the layout, scale and appearance of the building(s) and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called the reserved matters) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on site.

REASON: The application is in outline only.

2 (a) Application for approval of all the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

b) The development hereby approved must be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

REASON: In order to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the list of approved plans set out in the table below.

REASON: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved drawings, for the avoidance of doubt.

4 No surface water shall be allowed to connect (either directly or indirectly) to the public sewerage system.

REASON: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no detriment to the environment.

5 The reserved matters application shall be accompanied by a reptile survey and appropriate mitigation strategy (including a methodology for the capture and translocation of reptiles with details of the receptor site if necessary) to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

6 No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following:

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: Safeguarding of protected and priority species during construction works LDP policy NE1 and the Section 7 of the Environment Act (Wales) 2016.

7 The Reserved Matters application shall be accompanied by a "lighting design strategy" to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall:

- a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for protected and priority species and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
- b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.
- c) details of lighting fixtures and fittings / lighting features shall be provided including technical specifications
- d) demonstrate through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specification that areas important for biodiversity will not be adversely illuminated by internal light spill from buildings.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances shall any other external lighting be installed within the areas identified as being important for biodiversity under d) above without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

REASON: To safeguard foraging/commuting habitat of Species of Conservation Concern in accordance with Section 6 of the Environment Act (Wales) 2016 and LDP policies EP3 and NE1.

8 A landscape plan shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority in conjunction with the first reserved matters application.

The plan should include the following;

-Soft landscape details shall include details of the translocation of the northern hedgerow, buffer planting of the relocated hedgerow, including planting plans, specifications including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment, schedules of plants, noting species, sizes, numbers and densities.

-Details of biodiversity enhancements including Bat roosting and Bird nesting provision.

REASON: To safeguard all Green Infrastructure Assets at the site in accordance with LDP policies, DES1, S13, GI1, NE1, EP1 and SD4.

9 A Green Infrastructure Management Plan shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority in conjunction with the first reserved matters application.

The GI Management Plan should include the following;

a) Description and evaluation of Green Infrastructure assets to be managed to include as a minimum:

i) Green corridors

ii) Biodiversity enhancements

iii) Reptile mitigation site as necessary

b) Aims and objectives of management.

d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.

e) Prescriptions for management actions.

f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a twenty-year period).

g) Trends and constraints on site that might influence management

h) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.

i) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The Management Plan shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the Green Infrastructure Management Plan are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning Green Infrastructure objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To safeguard all Green Infrastructure Assets at the site in accordance with LDP policies, DES1, S13, GI1, NE1, EP1 and SD4.

10 No development shall commence on site until the developer has entered into an Agreement with the Highway Authority for the provision of the proposed link footways for which parts are contained within the existing public highway.

Reason : To encourage active travel in accordance with PPW Ed. 10.

11 No development shall commence on site until a detailed highway surface water management scheme has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason : To ensure that surface water is managed appropriately in accordance with Policy SD4 of the LDP.

12 Prior to any works commencing on site a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, which shall include traffic management measures, hours of working, measures to control dust, noise and related nuisances,

and measures to protect adjoining users from construction works and measures to ensure that all construction traffic will be kept on site with suitable turning facilities so that all traffic can enter and exit in forward gear for both accesses. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved CTMP only.

Reason : In order to protect residential amenity in accordance with Policy EP1 of the LDP.

13 No development shall commence until an Estate Street Phasing and Completion Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Estate Street Phasing and Completion Plan shall set out the development phases and the standards that estate streets serving each phase of the development shall be completed.

Reason: - To ensure that the estate streets serving the development are completed and thereafter maintained to an acceptable standard in the interest of residential / highway safety; to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the highways infrastructure serving the development and to safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and users of the highway in accordance with Policies EP1, DES1 and MV1 of the LDP.

14 No development shall commence until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an agreement has been entered into under section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a private management and Maintenance Company has been established.

Reason: To ensure that the estate streets serving the development are maintained to an acceptable standard in the interest of residential / highway safety; to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the highways infrastructure serving the development and to safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and users of the highway in accordance with Policies EP1, DES1 and MV1 of the LDP.

INFORMATIVES

1 In satisfying condition 6, the developer is advised to see BS 42020:2013, Clause 10, for a comprehensive list of issues and activities that may be considered and included within a CEMP.