

# **Appendix 4**

Candidate Site Register Summary of Representations

## Strategic Sites

Abergavenny	
Candidate Site: CS0213 Abergavenny East	Responder:
<p><b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. Southern boundary adjoins the essential setting of Coldbrook House, Caederwen and other farms shown on the Tithe, exist with similar field boundaries.</li> </ol> <p><i>General support for the site:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council and Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society state that objection would be made to anything but a strategic decision that development here has to be the long-term future of Abergavenny. Various physical constraints make this area the only substantial option for town growth. The masterplanning EA should proceed if the feasibility and viability of land use allocation and the phasing of development are to be soundly based for inclusion in the replacement plan.</li> <li>3. Responders feel that the site boundaries should extend to encompass more land adjoining A465 for a junction with the trunk road, station car parking and an active travel crossing to Station Road as well as providing a more direct access to Ross Road. Any active travel bridge or subway crossing the railway and the A465 must be attractive to use in all conditions.</li> <li>4. The site sponsor, The Coldbrook Estate, has submitted supporting documents and includes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site presents a logical extension to the town that could be well connected local services and facilities.</li> <li>• The land is not subject to any statutory designations and is located close to employment opportunities, schools, healthcare and the range of facilities and services offered by Abergavenny Town Centre.</li> <li>• Matters considered as part of delivering the vision for Abergavenny East includes provision of significant infrastructure, including a cycle footway bridge over the A465 and railway.</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Many responders offer support for the site – which should benefit from it's proximity to the A465, the railway station and services and facilities within the town.</li> <li>6. Proximity of the rail station to the site has been emphasised and it is felt that a frequency of 4 trains per hour, twice the current frequency, is necessary.</li> <li>7. Responders feel that the site should incorporate a suitable solution to the parking problem at the railway station.</li> <li>8. Responders feel that the area is generally screened from A465 by trees and there are hedgerows and small woodlands that should be incorporated into the layout of development.</li> <li>9. Responders state that the agricultural land appears to be of 3a and 3b value.</li> <li>10. Responders suggest that the ecology of the site could be improved by development that incorporates landscaping that encourages biodiversity.</li> <li>11. Responders feel that a smaller number of houses than proposed would be more in keeping the ambience of the town and area.</li> <li>12. Support for the site as the development would be near places of employment to a minimise travel to work.</li> <li>13. Responders feel that the site should be mixed use offering an industrial estate/business park as Abergavenny is devoid of any purpose built facilities.</li> </ol> <p><i>General objection to the site:</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>4. The Coldbrook Estate</li> <li>5. 188 Private Individuals.</li> <li>6. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>7. SOUL (163), 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>9. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>10. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>14. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>15. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>16. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>17. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>18. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>19. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>20. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>21. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>22. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<p>14. Concern re landscape sensitivity. The site forms a significant proportion of the area A019 in a landscaping sensitivity report (Mar 2021). The area is classed in the highest sensitivity bracket.</p> <p>15. Concern re the impact of development on views from Abergavenny and Castle meadows and of the impact of light pollution on wildlife and biodiversity on The Little Skirrid and surrounding area.</p> <p>16. Concern re the slope of the site and the difficulties this will pose for development.</p> <p>17. Concern re run off water from the site and the potential risk of flooding this poses to the railway line.</p> <p>18. Concern re the potential increase in traffic and the ability of the road network to cope.</p> <p>19. Concern re lack of potential Active Travel solutions due to the railway line and A465 as well as the slope of the site.</p> <p>20. Concern whether the site would be connected to the main sewage system or would require it's own treatment plant.</p> <p>21. Concern re the power supply to the area being able to cope with new housing being all electric.</p> <p>22. General concerns re local services and employment being sufficient to cater for a site this size.</p>	
<b>Chepstow</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0165 Land at Mouton Road, Chepstow</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Agricultural use and potential features associated with the Roman road at the south of the site. Development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>2. Chepstow Town Council support the site as long as development provides at least 50% affordable housing.</li> <li>3. Chepstow Town Council support for the site as development may provide employment opportunities.</li> <li>4. Responders feel that the site should not be supported without infrastructure improvements including provision of a bypass, improvements to Highbeech roundabout and an M48 link.</li> <li>5. Responders object as the site forms an essential part of the green wedge between Pwllmeyric and Chepstow.</li> <li>6. Responders object to the development of green field sites when there are brownfield sites in the county.</li> <li>7. Responders state that the proposed areas form the gateway to the Wye Valley which attracts visitors.</li> <li>8. Responders feel that development of the site will have a visual impact on the nearby AONB and on the listed building adjacent to the site.</li> <li>9. Concerns for the surrounding green spaces, used extensively by local people for leisure, and supports local, protected species such as deer, bats and birds of prey.</li> <li>10. Responders state that the is on prime agricultural land which should not be developed.</li> <li>11. Cllr Louise Brown states that the land should be reserved for potential roundabout improvements at Highbeech.</li> <li>12. Concerns regarding the safety of a Proposed Balancing Lake for surface water drainage and concerns as to whether the sewage pumping facilities may be inadequate.</li> <li>13. Responders feel there is a lack of detail in plans to provide new employment in the area. Workers currently employed in the area do not earn enough to be able to afford the properties being built.</li> <li>14. A responder comments that the plan suggests working from home will continue but evidence suggests people are returning to the workplace.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Chepstow Town Council</li> <li>3. Chepstow Town Council</li> <li>4. Cllr Louise Brown plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Mathern Community Council Cllr Louise Brown plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Mathern Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. Mathern Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. Cllr Louise Brown</li> <li>12. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>13. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. Mathern Community Council Cllr Louise Brown plus 22 Private Individuals</li> </ol>

	<p>15. Concerns that traffic congestion within Chepstow, particularly Highbeech roundabout and Hardwick Hill, is at unacceptable levels. Any incidents or planned closures cause excessive queues.</p> <p>16. Concerns that Chepstow is a Designated Air Quality Management Area with high, potentially illegal, levels of air pollution within Chepstow (contrary to Wellbeing of Future Generations Act).</p> <p>17. Development in Gloucestershire, and the wider community, will impact traffic levels in Chepstow and demand for services.</p> <p>18. A responder feels that access to the site will be challenging and require extensive remodelling of the Highbeech area.</p> <p>19. Concerns that local infrastructure and services are already overstretched with no capacity to serve this site. Local roads are congested, public transport is poor, schools are oversubscribed, it's difficult to get a GP appointment, no spaces available at NHS dentists, no longer a local hospital facility. Shortage of leisure and community facilities and no cultural facilities such as a theatre or cinema.</p> <p>20. Responders feel that the site is far from the town centre, and areas of local employment, and this along with the steep hills will encourage use of the car.</p> <p>21. Responders feel that public transport is insufficient. This site is too far from the railway station and the hills too steep to encourage use of the train, thereby encouraging use of the car.</p> <p>22. Concerns that there is no provision for safe walking and Active Travel routes.</p> <p>23. Responders feel that little affordable/social housing has been provided and no evidence of any Section 106 funds relieving any of the underlying problems. Any housing built here should be affordable for the local community who work locally.</p> <p>24. Concerns regarding lack of provision of formal and informal open spaces and Green Infrastructure onsite.</p> <p>25. Concerns that congestion is putting visitors off coming to Chepstow and supporting the shops and food outlets, resulting in a disappointing level of shopping.</p> <p>26. Concern that Chepstow is overdeveloped and will become a commuter town with no sense of community, and, with commuters bringing no benefit to local shops.</p> <p>27. Criticism of the LDP process - no consultation on candidate sites for protection, CS0165 assessed as most favourable but not selected as the preferred site.</p> <p>28. Responders state that the plan claims houses will be built as net carbon zero ready, however, no recent developments have been built to the high environmental standards we can now achieve.</p> <p>29. Responders state that the Council's Integrated Sustainability Appraisal makes it clear that development anywhere in Chepstow will make current traffic and pollution issues worse, with the (WeITAG) study demonstrating that the High Beech roundabout is already at full capacity.</p> <p>30. Concerns regarding contravention of UK Gov Policy, National Planning Policy and Localism Act - All residents of the affected areas will have a direct legal case for increased health risks.</p> <p>31. Concern that growth proposed by MCC is in conflict with WG's in terms of the number of houses advised to match job creation/growth. Growth figures exceed advice by 40%.</p>	<p>16. Mathern Community Council plus 10 Private Individuals</p> <p>17. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>18. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>19. Mathern Community Council Cllr Louise Brown plus 15 Private Individuals</p> <p>20. 6 Private Individuals</p> <p>21. 7 Private individuals</p> <p>22. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>23. Mathern Community Council plus 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>24. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>25. 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>26. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>27. 6 Private Individuals</p> <p>28. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>29. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>30. 4 Private Individuals</p> <p>31. 2 Private Individuals</p>
--	--	---

## Monmouth

**Candidate Site: CS0270 Leasbrook (Land north of Dixton Road)**

**Representor:**

No responses received

## Severnside

## Candidate Site: CS0087 Showground, Caldicot

## Representor:

Summary of Main Issues Raised:		Representor:
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – A previous response to the LDP and pre-planning consultation recommended desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work; additionally a Heritage Impact Assessment and to consult Cadw regarding any impact on the Scheduled Monuments nearby; our understanding of the site has not changed since then, and recommendation remains the same.</li> <li>2. Responders concerned re flood risk (surface water and river) on site as the site is in a flood zone, and whether the proposed developments will make the issue worse or that the site is suitable for development at all. The runoff from the site causes issues with roads and properties nearby, concerns that this will increase with development. Concerns that an on-site sewage treatment plant is not feasible on the site, the discharge of treated effluent could not be made to watercourse due to distance, and other treatment methods would not be appropriate due to the land area required to comply with building regulations. A site-specific flood modelling exercise should be undertaken as existing flood mapping does not seem to be consistent with current events. SuDS would need to be carefully considered and built into high-level development proposals. Concerns re the capacity of the current water supply, sewerage and drainage systems, and their ability to cope with an increase in residential units. Will the increased sewage outflow have an impact on the Severn SAC / SPA? Concerns that the development will increase the phosphate issue.</li> <li>3. Enquiries re the use of S106 funds to support a River Restoration Options Report for the lower 3km of the Nedern. Responders require clear evidence of where S106 money will be invested upfront and also evidenced on delivery.</li> <li>4. Responder and site promoters, Richborough Estates are positive about the progression of the site into Stage 3A Candidate Site Assessment, and its suitability for residential development. They note that the site is not subject to any fundamental constraints that cannot be mitigated. The responders also note that an FCA will be submitted in support of any future planning application, demonstrating that the site can be brought forward. An initial masterplan demonstrates that no built development is proposed on the areas within Flood Zones 2/3, and that an appropriate sustainable drainage strategy would result in a downstream benefit through a reduction in peak flow run-off from the development. The initial masterplan also demonstrates that there will be no development in areas of SSSI. The responders strongly maintain that the Showground site is suitable for residential development.</li> <li>5. Concerns re NHS services and a lack of health infrastructure, such as Doctors, GPs, and Dentists, struggling to meet the current demands, inducing long wait times for appointments and that a large development on this site would only exacerbate the current issues. Responders also concerned that no provisions have been made to deal with the increased demand for these services brought about by development on the site, such as a sufficient number of health job posts filled. Pharmacies and hospitals are also being overwhelmed. Responders concerned that there are no places in both the local Primary and Secondary schools for existing residents, not including the new residents from developments on the site. Concerns re Telephone and Broadband services being able to keep up with current and future demands after the site has been developed.</li> <li>6. Concerns re the site location and the increase in vehicle movement in the area once it's been developed. Concerns re the lack of pedestrian links from the site to Caldicot. Concerns that existing road infrastructure is not sufficient for existing volume of vehicles, with large volumes of traffic and long queues, let alone the vast increase after development has been complete. A "do-nothing" approach is not acceptable in Chepstow – The development on the site will increase traffic at High Beech subsequently increasing</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Portskewett Community Council plus 17 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Richborough Estates</li> <li>5. Portskewett Community Council plus 21 Private Individual</li> <li>6. Portskewett Community Council plus 23 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Portskewett Community Council plus 15 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. 13 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. Portskewett Community Council 13 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. Portskewett Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>13. 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>14. 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>15. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>16. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>17. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>18. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>19. Edenstone</li> <li>20. Taylor Wimpey PLC (Savills)</li> </ol>

air pollution. Concerns that essential improvements to road infrastructure will not be completed by 2033. Responders concerned about traffic moving into smaller local lanes to find alternative routes, resulting in dangerous driving and the overuse of roads that are not meant to cope with that volume of traffic. Concerns that commuting will increase due to the developments on the site and the lack of local links prompts people to choose their cars over other modes of transport. Concerns re the lack of pavements in the areas surrounding the site. Noise pollution will also see a dramatic increase with development of the site reducing the quality of life and health conditions. Responders believe there is a need for a reduction in speed through Crick to 30mph. Concerns re a lack of safe crossing points to important zones such as school pick up and drop off points. Concerns regarding the route taken by construction traffic and its safety. Concerns re a lack of pedestrian links. Concerns re the quality of the roads in the area and an increase in volume of traffic will only deteriorate them further. Responders concerned over the lack of road infrastructure improvements made, compared to the volume of developments completed. Concerns over poor traffic movement due to 20mph speed limits and the increase of traffic in other areas in order to avoid the imposition.

7. Concerns that area is being developed to facilitate commuters, creating a suburb of Bristol, Newport, and Cardiff, capitalising on the proximity to the Severn crossing now that the tolls have been removed.
8. Concerns re town centre and its state of deterioration, many shops are empty, and the main street is not a very nice place to walk at night - therefore it is not suitable to support the needs of the existing community, which will only be amplified by the development of this site. Responders concerned as there are zero real plans for infrastructure and amenity improvement. Public transport services in the area are not sufficient – bus service is limited and does not support commuting, lack of accessibility to the nearest train station with inadequate parking facilities, and no provisions have been provided for safe walking and cycling routes. Concerns re a lack of facilities for young people such as children’s playparks, youth centres. Caldicot leisure centre was due to be upgraded but has not happened. Responders believe the infrastructure and amenities to support such developments on the site should be addressed first. Responders concerned that development of the site removes an important recreation and tourist facility, which not only boosts the local economy but is one of the sole reasons people visit Caldicot.
9. Responders concerned re classification of the site as brownfield when the majority of the land is greenspace and could be classed as agricultural due to its uses, which will be lost after development. Responders note that the ecology of the natural environment should be protected for current and future generations. Concern re the finished site’s ability to increase biodiversity in the area and that the development will cause habitat loss, increasing pressure on other areas of SSSI such as Nedern Wetland, due to increased human activity. Responders note that interruption to the Nedern Brook green corridor, and adverse effects on the landscape surrounding Caldicot Castle, including views in and out, would be undesirable and should be avoided.
10. Concerns re the size of the development and its location in relation to Caldicot, making the site appear like a new village. Concerns re size of development being too large when compared to other recent developments in the local area. The impacts of the developments scale would mean that local villages would be subsumed by Caldicot, impacting the local character and appearance of the area, removing their historic identity. Concerns re the number of developments in the local area surrounding the site and the proximity those developments to each other, noting the area to be overdeveloped. Responders note the volume of housing proposed for the site and believe the distribution is disproportionate to the rest of Monmouthshire, changing the dynamic of the surrounding area.
11. Concerns re the volume of social housing concentrated in Caldicot because of the development of this site and therefore the separation of people from the areas in which their families live. Concerns regarding the ability to fulfil affordable housing targets and that developers are allowed to build for profit, catering towards 4/5-bedroom homes for professional middle-aged people, and

not for local young people. Concerns that the developments will be marketed towards those mainly from the Bristol area and won't be affordable for locals, noting that the average salary is much higher in Bristol than Monmouthshire. Responders desire a positive help to buy scheme for young locals. Responders note that the removal of the bridge tolls did not help young people to buy homes as the average house price in the area increased and that the Redrow Sudbrook development did not meet its affordable housing targets, suggesting that affordable housing should be allocated away from the Severnside area.

12. Concerns re limited employment opportunities in the area, especially for those without transport. Responders note that those who gain work in employment opportunities provided in the local area will not be able to afford to live in the areas being developed.
13. Responders concerned re change in use of the site as it currently promotes the local area and brings people to the town. Responders note that a key criterion for developing the candidate sites is tourism and that the current site's use provides a significant tourism element to the local economy as it hosts local, regional, national, and international level events throughout the year. Concerns re maintaining the area as country site and that attractions such as David Broom's Centre on the site, supports shops and food outlets providing local employment, which will be removed if developed. The Castle provides a brilliant venue for concerts, gatherings etc, which will be sat in the middle of a housing estate when the development is completed. Responders note that if this site is developed then it will lose its unique equine interest and business that it brings to the area. The visual proximity of the development to Caldicot Castle Country Park creates a negative heritage and wellbeing impact. Concerns that the development does not protect the landscape and heritage that makes Monmouthshire unique, special and an attractive place to live or help in sustaining rural communities.
14. Responders believe that the council's approach to Climate change is unsatisfactory and believe the high quality of environmental standards promised by developments will not be met, noting that the term "net zero ready homes" does not actually mean anything. Concerns that provisions made by the council towards the net zero goals will not prevent the detrimental impact this development will have on the surrounding area. Responders concerned that the allocation of this semi-rural site for development is in complete disregard to Monmouthshire's desires to cut commuting to work for environmental purposes. Concerns that this style of development is that of housing estates from the 70s and does not respect the environment.
15. Responder believes there is a lack of trust between the council and the communities it serves as the council continues to ignore their comments and not communicate effectively, therefore the community will continue to object to these kinds of proposals.
16. Responder believes the plan contradicts itself as so much development has been proposed for Monmouthshire, yet it admits it is not in the national growth area identified in Future Wales 2040.
17. Responder notes that CS0251 Land at Bradbury Farm is to come forward in tandem with this site to proceed. Concerns re who is going to control the process and the risk involved, such as the Land at Bradbury Farm being developed but developers for this site changing their mind, or the landowner pulling out as it is a family run business, therefore producing a situation against Welsh Government Guidelines by building in open countryside.
18. Responder notes that the increased volume of new developments encouraging those from Bristol to move and commute, reduces the amount of local youngster, further contributing to a dilution of those who have an interest in speaking Welsh, which needs support if it is to survive in Monmouthshire.
19. Promoter for site CS0206, Edenstone, believe their site (Land South of Newport Road, Magor) best contributes to the vision and objectives of the RLDP and the achievement of sustainable development within the Severnside region when compared with CS0087 Showground for the below reasons.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landscape of the Showground is more sensitive to residential development than that of the Land South of Newport Road, Magor.</li> <li>• Concerns that Showground land area is of predictive Grade 1 and 2 BMV, and that lower grade areas or non BMV, such as the Land South of Newport Road, Magor, should be considered in advance of BMV land.</li> <li>• Showground site is located a further walking distance away from the town centre than Land South of Newport Road, Magor is from Magor Centre. Time taken to walk from the Showground site to the town centre is greater than 20 minutes and over 30 minutes to the train station, therefore not meeting the council's aspirations for 20-minute neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Showground site includes areas of flood risk.</li> <li>• Concerns that Caldicot East has the potential to impact upon Caldicot Conservation Area and Caldicot Castle Grade I Listed Building and Scheduled Monument, whereas Land South of Newport Road is free from any heritage constraints.</li> </ul> <p>20. Promoter for site CS0253 and CS0254, Taylor Wimpey PLC (Savills), compares the performance of their site (Ifton Manor Farm, Site A and B), against CS0087 Showground, Caldicot (Caldicot East). Taylor Wimpey believe the Ifton Manor Farm site performs more strongly than the Caldicot East site for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ifton Manor Farm site performs better in the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal than the Caldicot East Site.</li> <li>• Ifton Manor Farm site is more favourable in its ability to capitalise on Sustainable Transport Infrastructure and encourage modal shift.</li> <li>• Ifton Manor Farm performs better in 9, the same in 8 and worse in 1, when compared to the Caldicot East site, out of the objectives set out in the current Preferred Strategy to provide a useful framework to assess the performance of Strategic Growth Options.</li> <li>• Believes the proposed number of houses to be delivered within a set time frame for the Caldicot East site is unrealistic, due to reason such as securing planning permission, marketing the site, creation of new infrastructure to support the development and the rate of unit delivery seen in similar sites locally.</li> </ul> <p>21. Taylor Wimpey notes that the Preferred Strategy being consulted upon entirely fails to give due weight to the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal, therefore Taylor Wimpey notes the settlement to be unsound as the Caldicot East site was selected to proceed over Ifton Manor Farm.</p>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0251 Land at Bradbury Farm, Crick</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – A previous response to LDP consultation recommended desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work: our understanding of the site has not changed since the and recommendation stays the same.</li> <li>2. Concerns re placemaking and its consideration of existing settlements, as building retail and leisure units on the site is likely to have an adverse effect on Caldicot town centre, where the focus should lie.</li> <li>3. Promoter for site CS0206, Edenstone, believe their site (Land South of Newport Road, Magor) best contributes to the vision and objectives of the RLDP and the achievement of sustainable development within the Severnside region when compared with CS0087 Showground for the below reasons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landscape of the Showground is more sensitive to residential development than that of the Land South of Newport Road, Magor.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. Edenstone</li> <li>4. Taylor Wimpey PLC (Savills)</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. Portskewett Community Council plus 14 Private Individuals</li> </ol>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that Showground land area is of predictive Grade 1 and 2 BMV, and that lower grade areas or non BMV, such as the Land South of Newport Road, Magor, should be considered in advance of BMV land.</li> <li>• Showground site is located a further walking distance away from the town centre than Land South of Newport Road, Magor is from Magor Centre. Time taken to walk from the Showground site to the town centre is greater than 20 minutes and over 30 minutes to the train station, therefore not meeting the council's aspirations for 20-minute neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Showground site includes areas of flood risk.</li> <li>• Concerns that Caldicot East has the potential to impact upon Caldicot Conservation Area and Caldicot Castle Grade I Listed Building and Scheduled Monument, whereas Land South of Newport Road is free from any heritage constraints.</li> </ul> <p>4. Promoter for site CS0253 and CS0254, Taylor Wimpey PLC (Savills), compares the performance of their site (Ifton Manor Farm, Site A and B), against CS0087 Showground, Caldicot (Caldicot East). Taylor Wimpey believe the Ifton Manor Farm site performs more strongly than the Caldicot East site for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ifton Manor Farm site performs better in the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal than the Caldicot East Site.</li> <li>• Ifton Manor Farm site is more favourable in its ability to capitalise on Sustainable Transport Infrastructure and encourage modal shift.</li> <li>• Ifton Manor Farm performs better in 9, the same in 8 and worse in 1, when compared to the Caldicot East site, out of the objectives set out in the current Preferred Strategy to provide a useful framework to assess the performance of Strategic Growth Options.</li> <li>• Believes the proposed number of houses to be delivered within a set time frame for the Caldicot East site is unrealistic, due to reason such as securing planning permission, marketing the site, creation of new infrastructure to support the development and the rate of unit delivery seen in similar sites locally.</li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey notes that the Preferred Strategy being consulted upon entirely fails to give due weight to the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal, therefore Taylor Wimpey notes the settlement to be unsound as the Caldicot East site was selected to proceed over Ifton Manor Farm.</li> </ul> <p>5. Responders require clear evidence of where S106 money will be invested upfront and also evidenced on delivery.</p> <p>6. Responders concerned re flood risk (surface water and river) on site as the site is in a flood zone, and whether the proposed developments will make the issue worse or that the site is suitable for development at all. The runoff from the site causes issues with roads and properties nearby, concerns that this will increase with development. Concerns that an on-site sewage treatment plant is not feasible on the site, the discharge of treated effluent could not be made to watercourse due to distance, and other treatment methods would not be appropriate due to the land area required to comply with building regulations. A site-specific flood modelling exercise should be undertaken as existing flood mapping does not seem to be consistent with current events. SuDS would need to be carefully considered and built into high-level development proposals. Concerns re the capacity of the current water supply, sewerage and drainage systems, and their ability to cope with an increase in residential units. Will the increased sewage outflow have an impact on the Severn SAC / SPA? Concerns that the development will increase the phosphate issue.</p> <p>7. Concerns re NHS services and a lack of health infrastructure, such as Doctors, GPs, and Dentists, struggling to meet the current demands, inducing long wait times for appointments and that a large development on this site would only exacerbate the current issues. Responders also concerned that no provisions have been made to deal with the increased demand for these services brought about by development on the site, such as a sufficient number of health job posts filled. Pharmacies and hospitals are also being</p>	<p>7. Portskewett Community Council plus 18 Private Individuals</p> <p>8. Portskewett Community Council plus 18 Private Individuals</p> <p>9. 5 Private Individuals</p> <p>10. Portskewett Community Council plus 14 Private Individuals</p> <p>11. 13 Private Individuals</p> <p>12. Portskewett Community Council plus 10 Private Individuals</p> <p>13. 5 Private Individuals</p> <p>14. Portskewett Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>15. 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>16. 4 Private Individuals</p> <p>17. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>18. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>19. 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>20. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>21. 1 Private Individual</p>
--	---	---

overwhelmed. Responders concerned that there are no places in both the local Primary and Secondary schools for existing residents, not including the new residents from developments on the site. Concerns re Telephone and Broadband services being able to keep up with current and future demands after the site has been developed.

8. Concerns re the site location and the increase in vehicle movement in the area once it's been developed. Concerns re the lack of pedestrian links from the site to Caldicot. Concerns that existing road infrastructure is not sufficient for existing volume of vehicles, with large volumes of traffic and long queues, let alone the vast increase after development has been complete. A "do-nothing" approach is not acceptable in Chepstow – The development on the site will increase traffic at High Beech subsequently increasing air pollution. Concerns that essential improvements to road infrastructure will not be completed by 2033. Responders concerned about traffic moving into smaller local lanes to find alternative routes, resulting in dangerous driving and the overuse of roads that are not meant to cope with that volume of traffic. Concerns that commuting will increase due to the developments on the site and the lack of local links prompts people to choose their cars over other modes of transport. Concerns re the lack of pavements in the areas surrounding the site. Noise pollution will also see a dramatic increase with development of the site reducing the quality of life and health conditions. Responders believe there is a need for a reduction in speed through Crick to 30mph. Concerns re a lack of safe crossing points to important zones such as school pick up and drop off points. Concerns regarding the route taken by construction traffic and its safety. Concerns re a lack of pedestrian links. Concerns re the quality of the roads in the area and an increase in volume of traffic will only deteriorate them further. Responders concerned over the lack of road infrastructure improvements made, compared to the volume of developments completed. Concerns over poor traffic movement due to 20mph speed limits and the increase of traffic in other areas in order to avoid the imposition.
9. Concerns that area is being developed to facilitate commuters, creating a suburb of Bristol, Newport, and Cardiff, capitalising on the proximity to the Severn crossing now that the tolls have been removed.
10. Concerns re town centre and its state of deterioration, many shops are empty, and the main street is not a very nice place to walk at night - therefore it is not suitable to support the needs of the existing community, which will only be amplified by the development of this site. Responders concerned as there are zero real plans for infrastructure and amenity improvement. Public transport services in the area are not sufficient – bus service is limited and does not support commuting, lack of accessibility to the nearest train station with inadequate parking facilities, and no provisions have been provided for safe walking and cycling routes. Concerns re a lack of facilities for young people such as children's playparks, youth centres. Caldicot leisure centre was due to be upgraded but has not happened. Responders believe the infrastructure and amenities to support such developments on the site should be addressed first. Responders concerned that development of the site removes an important recreation and tourist facility, which not only boosts the local economy but is one of the sole reasons people visit Caldicot.
11. Responders concerned re classification of the site as brownfield when the majority of the land is greenspace and could be classed as agricultural due to its uses, which will be lost after development. Responders note that the ecology of the natural environment should be protected for current and future generations. Concern re the finished site's ability to increase biodiversity in the area and that the development will cause habitat loss, increasing pressure on other areas of SSSI such as Nedern Wetland, due to increased human activity. Responders note that interruption to the Nedern Brook green corridor, and adverse effects on the landscape surrounding Caldicot Castle, including views in and out, would be undesirable and should be avoided.
12. Concerns re the size of the development and its location in relation to Caldicot, making the site appear like a new village. Concerns re size of development being too large when compared to other recent developments in the local area. The impacts of the developments scale would mean that local villages would be subsumed by Caldicot, impacting the local character and appearance

of the area, removing their historic identity. Concerns re the number of developments in the local area surrounding the site and the proximity those developments to each other, noting the area to be overdeveloped and urbanised. Responders note the volume of housing proposed for the site and believe the distribution is disproportionate to the rest of Monmouthshire, changing the dynamic of the surrounding area.

13. Concerns re the volume of social housing concentrated in Caldicot because of the development of this site and therefore the separation of people from the areas in which their families live. Concerns regarding the ability to fulfil affordable housing targets and that developers are allowed to build for profit, catering towards 4/5-bedroom homes for professional middle-aged people, and not for local young people. Concerns that the developments will be marketed towards those mainly from the Bristol area and won't be affordable for locals, noting that the average salary is much higher in Bristol than Monmouthshire. Responders desire a positive help to buy scheme for young locals. Responders note that the removal of the bridge tolls did not help young people to buy homes as the average house price in the area increased and that the Redrow Sudbrook development did not meet its affordable housing targets, suggesting that affordable housing should be allocated away from the Severnside area.
14. Concerns re limited employment opportunities in the area, especially for those without transport. Responders note that those who gain work in employment opportunities provided in the local area will not be able to afford to live in the areas being developed.
15. Responders concerned re change in use of the site as it currently promotes the local area and brings people to the town. Responders note that a key criterion for developing the candidate sites is tourism and that the current site's use provides a significant tourism element to the local economy as it hosts local, regional, national, and international level events throughout the year. Concerns re maintaining the area as country site and that attractions such as David Broom's Centre on the site, supports shops and food outlets providing local employment, which will be removed if developed. The Castle provides a brilliant venue for concerts, gatherings etc, which will be sat in the middle of a housing estate when the development is completed. Responders note that if this site is developed then it will lose its unique equine interest and business that it brings to the area. The visual proximity of the development to Caldicot Castle Country Park creates a negative heritage and wellbeing impact. Concerns that the development does not protect the landscape and heritage that makes Monmouthshire unique, special and an attractive place to live or help in sustaining rural communities.
16. Responders believe that the council's approach to Climate change is unsatisfactory and believe the high quality of environmental standards promised by developments will not be met, noting that the term "net zero ready homes" does not actually mean anything. Concerns that provisions made by the council towards the net zero goals will not prevent the detrimental impact this development will have on the surrounding area. Responders concerned that the allocation of this semi-rural site for development is in complete disregard to Monmouthshire's desires to cut commuting to work for environmental purposes. Concerns that this style of development is that of housing estates from the 70s and does not respect the environment.
17. Responder believes there is a lack of trust between the council and the communities it serves as the council continues to ignore their comments and not communicate effectively, therefore the community will continue to object to these kinds of proposals.
18. Responder believes the plan contradicts itself as so much development has been proposed for Monmouthshire, yet it admits it is not in the national growth area identified in Future Wales 2040.
19. Responders note that the site is located in open countryside and only connects to Caldicot via a flood zone, both criteria for ruling out sites for allocation.
20. Responder notes that there are areas that would make more sense, such as the fields over the road from the site behind the main road in Portskewett, that are owned by the council.

	21. Responder in partial support but concerned re landscape impact east, land levels, over reliance on cars as too far from Caldicot and the site being nearer to M48 Chepstow junction than Severn Tunnel junction. Responder notes that the extent of CS0251 goes beyond the strategic extent identified and believes the site should be pulled back and reduced.	
--	---	--

## Primary Settlements

### Abergavenny & Llanfoist

<b>Candidate Site: CS0056 South Brecon Road, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber - Adjacent to the route of a Roman Road, development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed written scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>2. Concerns were raised by several responders that the site's western and southern boundaries are not effectively screened and the site is exposed to views from the National Park.</li> <li>3. Several responders feel the site should be included in the policy for a Green Wedge buffer between the built-up area and the National Park.</li> <li>4. Traffic issues were raised with concerns that the existing road network would not cope with the increase in traffic and that a new junction may be required to access the A40.</li> <li>5. A responder states that the site is grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>6. A responder was concerned that the site would be isolated from the town by the A40 and might never form a natural part of the town active travel network.</li> <li>7. Support for the size and location of the site. Hopeful that it can come forward sooner and provide much needed affordable homes.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>5. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>6. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>7. Private Individual x 1</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0094 Penlanlas Farm, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerns were raised by several responders regarding the slope of the site, and its prominence in views from the east, and the lack of green infrastructure to help it blend into the landscape.</li> <li>2. Traffic issues were raised with concerns that increased traffic on Old Hereford Road would further overload Pen y Pound and its junction with the A40.</li> <li>3. Responders suggest that the slope of the site might render substantial Active Travel unlikely and would limit access to existing shops and of the town centre by foot, therefore, requiring a frequent bus service / increased use of the car.</li> <li>4. There is concern that allowing this site would set a precedent for other sites in the area.</li> <li>5. Support for the allocation of Land at Penlanlas Farm in the RLDP Candidate Sites Register.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> </ol>

	6. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.	3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny & District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town 4. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny & District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town 5. Edenstone Homes 6. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd
<b>Candidate Site: CS0108 North Hillgrove Avenue, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abergavenny Town Council state that the site is within CSP004, proposed Green Wedge between the built-up area and the National Park boundary at the highest part of the wedge.</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council feel that while development of the site would align with development to the south, the average slope is about 1 in 8 which is much steeper than recently developed land to the east.</li> <li>3. No objection in principle from Abergavenny Transition Town &amp; Abergavenny &amp; District Society – whilst the site is in CSP004 as part of the Green Wedge it is now felt that the site is not essential to the purposes of the Green Wedge or its development unacceptable in the landscape. If development goes ahead the green wedge should be formally and legally defined to prevent an argument that this development site sets a precedent.</li> <li>4. Responders feel that a thick hedgerow on the western boundary should be safeguarded, as should mature trees within the site and on its eastern boundary.</li> <li>5. Responders state that the site may be Grade 3a agricultural land.</li> <li>6. Responders suggest that vehicular access should be via Bretherton Way and/or Hillgrove Avenue/Poplars Road (with protection of trees) to avoid reliance on access only via the persimmon estate which would mean both estates using a single connection to Hereford Road.</li> <li>7. A responder states that the site would be close to a Primary School and shops etc. The town centre is about 2.5kms away. Hereford Road has an hourly bus service but the new estate would need a service. Some active travel connectivity may be available via the Persimmon estate when it is completed.</li> <li>8. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>9. The site promotor, The Stantonbury Building and Development Company, submitted a Vision Document to support consideration of their proposal.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abergavenny Town Council</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council</li> <li>3. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Town Council</li> <li>5. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>6. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>7. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>8. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>9. The Stantonbury Building and Development Company</li> </ol>

Candidate Site: CS0128 Land at Chapel Farm, Abergavenny	Responder:
<p><b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red - A linear parchmark is noted in the HER, this may be related to field boundaries remaining which are depicted in the Tithe of 1848.</li> <li>2. Responders state that the site is within CSP003 one of the proposed Green Wedge buffers between the built-up area and the National Park boundary and should be protected. Desire to retain the town's natural historic boundary with the National Park and keep the attractive setting of the Brecon Beacons, the town is famed for, intact.</li> <li>3. Concern that the site is prominent to views from the south towards Pentre Lane with no mitigating green infrastructure to help absorb it into the landscape.</li> <li>4. Site believed to be a SINCE and of very high ecological value supporting a high level of natural wildlife including birds of prey and mammals.</li> <li>5. Responders suggest that although the site may accommodate as many as 250 homes a much lower density would be necessary to reflect the character of adjoining development.</li> <li>6. Concern that Pentre Road (and surrounding roads) are very narrow lanes unsuitable for much vehicular traffic but popular for active travel and should be retained as such.</li> <li>7. Believed to be some liability to flood towards Pentre Road and fears this development could increase run-off flooding.</li> <li>8. Concerns that the connecting road network is inadequate to cope with a significant increase in traffic. This level of development would require a new direct access to the A40.</li> <li>9. Concerns that increase in traffic will cause queuing and affect air quality.</li> <li>10. Concerns regarding site access.</li> <li>11. Responders state that there are no local shops, town centre services are up to 2km away and only a two-hourly bus service. No extra jobs, schools or medical facilities are being proposed.</li> <li>12. The capacity of the local sewer network has been questioned and concerns regarding flooding caused by heavy rainfall.</li> <li>13. Believed to be Grade 3b agricultural land. Quality grazing land.</li> <li>14. Concerns that development at this site would set a precedent for other sites within CSP003.</li> <li>15. Responders state that Pentre Road and Pentre Lane provide valuable, accessible, amenity for the community: walking, cycling, riding. Hill walking corridor from Fairfield car park to several routes onto the Sugar Loaf, encouraging tourism.</li> <li>16. Responders state that the site provides a sense of tranquillity which is enjoyed by both locals and visitors, encouraging tourism, and benefiting health and wellbeing.</li> <li>17. Concern that the site contains The Pentre and is directly overlooked by Llwyndu Court, both listed buildings in their own special landscape settings.</li> <li>18. Concern that the site adjoins the Abergavenny Conservation Area.</li> <li>19. Responders state that Pentre Road forms the natural boundary to Abergavenny and development north of this road should not be allowed.</li> <li>20. Responders feel that brownfield sites, and empty buildings, should be developed before destroying the countryside.</li> <li>21. Abergavenny is already heavily developed; questioned whether the site is needed.</li> <li>22. General objection to development of this site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town, plus 103 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town, plus 17 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. 18 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>6. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society plus 9 Private Individuals.</li> <li>7. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, plus 2 Private Individuals.</li> <li>8. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town, Plus 50 other Private Individuals.</li> <li>9. 8 Private Individuals.</li> <li>10. 17 Private Individuals.</li> <li>11. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, plus 12 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp;</li> </ol>

		District Civic Society, plus 10 Private Individuals 13. Abergavenny & District Civic Society, plus 17 Private Individuals 14. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny & District Civic Society, 1 Private Individual 15. 36 Private Individuals 16. 18 Private Individuals 17. 9 Private Individuals 18. 12 Private Individuals 19. 2 Private Individuals 20. 2 Private Individuals 21. 1 Private Individual 22. 92 Private Individuals
<b>Candidate Site: CS0161 Land north of Hillside, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red - Includes part of the Registered Park and Garden of The Hill PGW (Gt) 62(MON). Cadw must be consulted and a Heritage Impact Assessment undertaken.</li> <li>2. Several responders feel the site should be included in the policy for a Green Wedge buffer between the built-up area and the National Park.</li> <li>3. The site is wooded and several comments were received stating that the woodland is an important element of the town's green infrastructure and is prominent from the east.</li> <li>4. A suggestion was made that a small number of homes, similar to those in the grounds of The Hill, might acceptable within the less wooded western portion of the site which falls within the Abergavenny Conservation Area.</li> <li>5. Traffic issues were raised with concerns that increased traffic on Old Hereford Road would further overload Pen y Pound and its junction with the A40. It was also stated that Deri Road should not be used for access to any development.</li> <li>6. Responders felt that the building of the King Henry 8 school has increased traffic excessively and that school children are at risk whilst using the narrow footpath.</li> <li>7. Responders suggest that the slope of the site might render substantial Active Travel unlikely and would limit access to existing shops and the town centre by foot, therefore, requiring a frequent bus service.</li> <li>8. A responder feels that this is not a suitable site for residential development and that there is a better site within the candidate site list.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>5. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>8. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> </ol>

<b>Candidate Site: CS0164 Land adjacent to Red Barn Farm (RBF1)</b>	<b>Responder:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Adjacent to the route of a Roman Road, previously recommended condition for written scheme of investigation for archaeological watching brief.</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council object as the site falls within CSP002.</li> <li>3. Several responders state that the National Park buffer zone proposal could allow for a trunk road by-pass, however, this is now unlikely due to WG policies.</li> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society and Abergavenny Transition Town support the site if it is needed in this plan and if Abergavenny East site is unviable.</li> <li>5. A responder states that the site is Grade 3a agricultural land.</li> <li>6. Responders state the site is close to the National Park boundary but visually separated from it by a belt of woodland.</li> <li>7. Responders state that flood risk from mountain streams may reduce the potential number of dwellings; potentially 60 homes but half that if a road line had to be safeguarded. Site is on an active floodplain.</li> <li>8. Responders state that a new access to the A40 would be needed; perhaps shared with a new hospital access.</li> <li>9. Abergavenny Transition town wants the spinney between the two sites retained for an active travel route.</li> <li>10. Concerns that traffic will increase on road which are already at capacity.</li> <li>11. Concerns that there is a shortage of doctors, dentists and school places within Abergavenny.</li> <li>12. Concerns regarding a lack of employment in the area; houses should be built where there are employment opportunities.</li> <li>13. Abergavenny Transition town suggests that any housing ought to be prioritised for allocation to hospital staff to reduce in-commuting.</li> <li>14. Concern that access to the site is difficult and would require the removal of hedgerows. Responders state that the hedgerow along the A40 should be retained.</li> <li>15. A responder states that the site is part of the river Usk SAC; it is presently open fields, with a rural feel, and provides natural habitat for bats, hedgehogs, voles and many other protected species.</li> <li>16. The site falls within the Neville Hall RIGS and comprises three components: Neville Hall moraine feature and section, cemented outwash gravel section, post-glacial abandoned river channels and scroll marks on floodplain. The impact of proposed developments will depend on the nature of the RIGS feature, so early consultation with the local RIGS group or NRW is strongly recommended.</li> <li>17. A responder states that the site is adjacent to Red Barn Farm listed buildings and forms part of its unique setting or curtilage.</li> <li>18. Concerns that development would cause noise and light pollution to surrounding protected areas.</li> <li>19. Concerns re increased pollution into the river Usk and Nant Iago stream.</li> <li>20. Concerns re detriment to visual amenity for residents and tourists as well as loss of privacy for residents living next to the site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>5. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>6. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>7. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>9. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>14. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>



		16. SEWRIGS group 1 Private Individual 17. 1 Private Individual 18. 1 Private Individual 19. 1 Private Individual 20. 1 Private Individual
<b>Candidate Site: CS0174 Nantgavenny Lane, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<b>SITE FILTERED OUT</b> 1. The site is within CSP001 the proposed Green Wedge to protect the lower sides of the Gavenny Valley from further development. The Gavenny Valley should be protected as a vital publicly accessible green lung. 2. Concerns that the steeply sloping wooded lower part of the site is a SINC and partly liable to flood. 3. Concerns regarding the impact of housing on landscape value, the wildlife interest and the river quality. 4. Responder states that the site is Grade 3a agricultural land.	1. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny & District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town 2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny & District Civic Society 3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny & District Civic Society 4. Abergavenny & District Civic Society
<b>Candidate Site: CS0178 Abergavenny Workhouse</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Built 1837-9 as a Workhouse, some alteration and restoration, any change will need mitigation; building recording and potentially archaeological monitoring of ground disturbance by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation. 2. Responders suggest that the present designation as a protected employment site should be maintained particularly for its wide variety of different building volumes and types. 3. Responders suggest that although only one building is listed, the complex of Victorian workhouse buildings has considerable architectural and historic qualities that would benefit from tidying up. 4. Concern regarding CS0178 and CS0286 appearing the same, apart from residential being included in CS0286. Clarification wanted whether the schemes include any demolition.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd 2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny & District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town 3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny & District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town 4. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny & District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town

<b>Candidate Site: CS0185 West of Glebe Cottage, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Potential Medieval settlement and land use; desk-based assessment undertaken; archaeological monitoring of ground disturbance by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>2. Conditional acceptance by Abergavenny Town Council and Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society – The site lies within CSP001 proposed Green Wedge to protect the attractive and wildlife rich lower sides of the Gavenny Valley from development. It is also within the setting of St Teilo's Church, a Grade 1 Listed Building.</li> <li>3. In 2018 Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society objected to an application for housing on the site. Following considerable modification, the application (for 12 affordable homes) was approved but is on hold due to drainage issues. We can now accept development here provided that the design and purpose of the housing are little changed.</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Transition Town state that the Gavenny Valley should be protected as a vital publicly accessible piece of green infrastructure, a green lung from the centre of town out to the open countryside along the river that gave the town its name.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>3. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0192 Old Hereford Road, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>2. Responders state that the site is within CSP004 the proposed well-defined Green Wedge buffer between the built-up area and the National Park boundary. It lies at the highest part of the Wedge and is particularly prominent in views from the east.</li> <li>3. Concerns regarding increased traffic on Old Hereford Road which further overload Pen y Pound and it's junction with the A40.</li> <li>4. Concerns that the slope of the site would make substantial Active Travel unlikely and would limit the accessibility of local shops and the town centre.</li> <li>5. Responders state that a frequent bus service would be essential.</li> <li>6. The site sponsor, Candleston Homes, has submitted extensive information in support of the site, and includes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is in Flood Zone 1 for both Rivers and Sea, and, surface water flooding; therefore there is no reason why the site cannot be developed from a flood risk.</li> <li>• Landscape and Green Infrastructure assessments conclude that the site is suitable for development with appropriate mitigation.</li> <li>• A high pressure gas main crosses the site which affects the site's capacity but not it's overall suitability.</li> <li>• The site is sustainably located and is proximate to a range of services and well served by existing active travel routes and public transport.</li> <li>• The Site Ecology Assessment concludes the site is considered to have 'Medium' value and would be suitable for development.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>5. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>6. Candleston Homes</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0220 Ross Road, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. Area includes a Water Mill, probably of Medieval origin, part of Mardy Park, also potentially of Medieval origin and prehistoric artefacts noted.</li> <li>2. Object – the site is the key section of CSP001 protecting the Gavenny Valley between the built-up area and the railway/A465 from further development.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp;</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Concern that part of the site is a SINC and liable to flood. These flood plains help protect the town from flooding further downstream. Further concerns are that developing this steeply sloping site would further increase the risk of flood during periods of heavy rain fall.</li> <li>4. An ancient woodland SSSI is astride the site north of Ross Road forming an east-west wildlife corridor that continues east of A465. Many TPOs believed to be present. Undisturbed landscape and wildlife qualities of CSP001 would be lost. This is a vital, publicly accessible green lung from the town centre to the open countryside used as amenity land by local residents and organised groups.</li> <li>5. Responders state that the river Gavenny which runs through the site has a healthy population of White Clawed Crayfish -protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 / listed as endangered on the global IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and must be protected.</li> <li>6. Responders state that the MCC Ecological Site Assessment, undertaken on this site during preparation of the previous plan, identified that the bio-diversity constraints were enough to recommend that development of a large proportion of the site should be avoided.</li> <li>7. Responder suggests the site may be grade 3a agricultural land.</li> <li>8. Concern regarding access issues from Ross Road; Nantgavenny Lane is unsuitable as access.</li> <li>9. Concern regarding the potential increase in traffic and the ability of the road network to cope.</li> <li>10. Responders feel that there is a lack of public transport into Abergavenny.</li> <li>11. Concern regarding local services being able to cope with an increase in population as well as poor accessibility to local amenities from the site.</li> <li>12. Concerns that the drainage and sewerage systems are at capacity.</li> <li>13. Comments regarding currently uninterrupted views to the Skirrid mountain and countryside, from many areas of the Mardy and north Abergavenny, which would be adversely affected.</li> <li>14. Responders stated that currently there is a high number of empty and unsold homes (both existing and new build) in the local area, so why build more?</li> <li>15. Responders state that other housing developments in the area have caused pollution of the river and received NRW fines and warnings. This site is closer to the river on both sides and likely to cause significant pollution.</li> <li>16. Responders feel that the site would be subject to excessive noise from the railway line and the A465. The woodland on site currently helps to reduce the noise from the A465 for residents to the West.</li> <li>17. Concerns for light pollution and the loss of dark skies at night which support many species such as owls and bats as well as providing a venue for local 'stargazers'.</li> <li>18. Responders state that preserving the site supports MCC, Welsh Government and NRW environmental policies.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. District Civic Society, plus 8 Private Individuals Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, plus 28 Private Individuals.</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town, plus 29 Private Individuals.</li> <li>5. 12 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. 9 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>8. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, plus 13 Private Individuals.</li> <li>9. 16 Private Individuals.</li> <li>10. 6 Private Individuals.</li> <li>11. 10 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>13. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>14. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>15. 16 Private Individuals.</li> <li>16. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>17. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>18. 5 Private Individuals</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0247 Coopers III, Llanfoist</b>	<b>Responder:</b>	
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. The HER notes earthworks, agricultural features and boundaries. <i>No objection in principle</i></li> <li>2. Concern that road access via an extension of Jones Close would only be acceptable for about 10 homes and would require significant engineering. Access via the private treatment works access lane would require negotiation and improvement, including its junction with A4143.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>3. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society,</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Concern that land south of the access lane appears to be partly liable to flooding and there is a substantial wooded wetland in the lower part of the northern section, possibly of considerable ecological value, so not suitable for development.</li> <li>4. A responders suggests that much of the field to the east is above the flood plain and should be considered for future integrated development.</li> <li>5. A responders suggests that the trees on the northern boundary and the hedgerows on the easter and southern boundaries (of the northern section) should be substantially retained.</li> <li>6. The site sponsor, Johnsey Estates UK, has submitted information in support of the site and includes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is located close to employment opportunities, schools, healthcare and facilities and services at Abergavenny Town Centre and Llanfoist.</li> <li>• The southern parcel of land is available for any required off-site ecological mitigation and/or drainage should either be necessary.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>5. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>6. Johnsey Estates UK</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0248 Adj Llanfoist Primary School (Whole Site)</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. The HER notes the area as forming part of a 17<sup>th</sup> century park with likely Medieval origins.</li> <li>2. Responders stated that the woodland area of the site should not be built on.</li> <li>3. Concerns that the southern part of the site would be a marked, detached protrusion beyond the now well-defined eastern boundary of Llanfoist.</li> <li>4. Responders stated that the site is Grade 2 – 3b agricultural land.</li> <li>5. Concerns that development of the site would ruin the clear views to the mountains, and the edge of countryside feel, from the playground of the Primary school; a vital part of the children’s heritage.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>3. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0249 Red Barn Farm (RFB2), Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Formerly part of Neville Hall Park (Neville Court; The Brooks). Built 1860s; previously existing manor. Unlikely to require mitigation.</li> <li>2. Responders state that the site falls within CSP002, a National Park buffer zone proposal that also could allow for a trunk road by-pass (current WG policy prohibits this now).</li> <li>3. A responder felt that development would be a clearly visible urban intrusion into the Usk valley. It should remain part of a buffer zone between the well-landscaped hospital and the Park boundary.</li> <li>4. A responder suggests that the spinney between the two sites should be retained for an active travel route that could connect to the Llanwenarth national cycle route.</li> <li>5. A responder suggests that housing ought to be prioritised for hospital staff to reduce in-commuting.</li> <li>6. A responder feels that a new access would be needed to the A40, perhaps shared with a new hospital access.</li> <li>7. A responder feels that the hedgerow along A40 should be retained, contributing to the green corridor entry to the town.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>3. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>5. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>6. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> </ol>

	8. SEWRIGS group state that the two sites fall within the Nevill Hall RIGS comprising of three components. Nevill Hall moraine feature and section, cemented outwash gravel section, post-glacial abandoned river channels and scroll marks on floodplain. The impact of proposed developments will depend on the nature of the RIGS feature, so early consultation with the local RIGS group or NRW is strongly recommended.	7. Abergavenny Transition Town 8. SEWRIGS group
<b>Candidate Site: CS0250 Land at Evesham Nurseries, Llanfoist</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. Consult Cadw regarding the need for an ASIDOHL to determine the impact on the adjoining Blaenavon Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. The Blaenavon Industrial Landscape World Heritage Site also adjoins and assessment of the impact of the proposal on this is needed. Other features are noted in the area.</li> <li>2. A responder states that the site is Grade 3a agricultural land?</li> <li>3. Concerns re lack of local shops and facilities.</li> <li>4. Responders state that despite no extra allocations being made in the 2011-2021 LDP about 180 homes have been permitted in recent years and further allocations may be unpopular. Any further increase seems disproportionate to the number needed across the county.</li> <li>5. A responder suggests that the site, formerly a major horticultural site; could become an allotment site when the church reclaims the current site.</li> <li>6. The site sponsor, Bellway Homes, has submitted supporting documents and includes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site will not be at significant risk of flooding or increase the flood risk to others.</li> <li>• The site has access to a wide range of services and facilities within Abergavenny.</li> <li>• The site has access to excellent road links, railway station and a range of bus services.</li> <li>• Potential for 105 dwellings and is genuinely deliverable.</li> </ul> </li> <li>7. Concerns that some of the site has risk of flooding.</li> <li>8. Concerns for an ancient mound on the site.</li> <li>9. Concerns that access to the site is difficult.</li> <li>10. Responders state that the south west side of the site is bounded by the cycling route NCN46; making a crossing through this would diminish the amenity of the route.</li> <li>11. Concerns re the potential increase in traffic and the ability of the road network to cope.</li> <li>12. Concerns that development would compromise views and diminish the enjoyment of visitors and locals who use the canal and footpaths.</li> <li>13. Responders state that only a small proportion of the site is adjacent to the existing Llanfoist development boundary; adding this site would create a large peninsula with no natural boundary features.</li> <li>14. Responders state that the site is not within a tier of the settlement hierarchy that allows for growth in the Preferred Strategy.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>3. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>6. Bellway Homes</li> <li>7. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>13. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>14. 2 Private Individuals</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0263 Adj Llanfoist Fawr Primary School</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd

<b>Issues Raised:</b>	2. Abergavenny & District Civic Society and Abergavenny Transition Town state that the site is a solitary and valuable woodland Green Infrastructure. May need an ecological survey to establish quality. Should not be disturbed by development.	2. Abergavenny & District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town
<b>Candidate Site: CS0264 Land north of St Teilos, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. HER notes the area has a corn mill, and a post Medieval bridge is at the edge of the site. Less than 30m to the Medieval church enclosure.</li> <li>2. Concerns that the site adjoins the National Park boundary and within CSP001.</li> <li>3. Responders state that the site lies beyond the built-up extent of the town and is part of an area astride the Park boundary where residential development was quite recently refused by both MCC and the Park Authority.</li> <li>4. Concern that development would detract from St Teilo's Church, a Grade 1 Listed Building.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town, Sore Group</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0265 Tredilion Park, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. Tredilion Park: noted as Post-Medieval Park. Also traditional burial place of an Orgo the Giant, said to be pre AD634.</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society and Abergavenny Transition Town state there is no need to designate this site for tourism/leisure as already partly used for this and any planning applications should be considered through the planning process.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town, Sore Group</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0266 Land at Nantgavenny Business Park, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>2. Conditional Acceptance – site is within CSP001, however, due to recent provision of business units north of the site and the need for allocations of employment land in the area we do not object to light industrial use of the western park of this site provided specific conditions are met.</li> <li>3. Responders feel that the lower part of the site should be kept open similar to approved proposals at CS0185 and approval should not lead to further similar developments in Mardy Park to the south.</li> <li>4. Responders feel that the site edge nearest to the river should be carefully landscaped and filled with suitable, biodiverse planting.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> </ol>

		4. Abergavenny Transition Town
<b>Candidate Site: CS0267 Waterloo Court, Llanfoist</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. Part of the area falls within the Historic Landscape Character Area HLCA012 Llanfoist. Buildings noted as tenements on the Tithe Map &amp; Apportionment of 1843 on the roadside.</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society and Abergavenny Transition Town have no objection in principle.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town, SOUL</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0268 Westgate Gardens, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Adjoins the Registered Park of Linda Vista and the Essential Setting. Assessment of the impact will need to be undertaken to Cadw Guidance.</li> <li>2. Responders state that this site is an important piece of green infrastructure within the Conservation Area.</li> <li>3. Concern that the area acts as a flood meadow.</li> <li>4. Responders suggest that a derelict gateway at the western end suggests history worth investigating.</li> <li>5. Abergavenny Transition Town have no objection in principle.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. Abergavenny Transition Town</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0269 Land at Grove Farm, Llanfoist</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. The HER notes the area as forming part of a 17<sup>th</sup> century park and house, both with likely Medieval origins. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Objections due to insufficient information on what is intended as 'residential care' and until there is more detail it will not be known whether this is serving a justifiable local need.</li> <li>3. A responder felt that the Preferred Strategy suggests that the development of this area is unnecessary in the plan period.</li> <li>4. The site is Grade 2 – 3b agricultural land.</li> <li>5. SOUL supports the proposal.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>3. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>5. SOUL</li> </ol>

<b>Candidate Site: CS0284 Pen-y-Worlod Stables, Llanfoist</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society object – the site is dependent on CS0250 to which we also object.</li> <li>3. SOUL Support the site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>3. SOUL</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0286 Abergavenny Workhouse, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Built 1837-9 as a Workhouse, some alteration and restoration, any change will need mitigation; building recording and potentially archaeological monitoring of ground disturbance by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>2. Responders state that the present designation as a protected employment site should be maintained.</li> <li>3. Responders state that while only one building is Listed, the complex of Victorian workhouse buildings would benefit from tidying up.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, Abergavenny Transition Town</li> </ol>
<b>Chepstow</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0029 Barnetts Farm Chepstow</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Earlier buildings noted on historic mapping sequences, condition for written scheme of investigation for mitigation in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>2. A responder stated that information presented did not identify the number, type, or mix of dwellings/affordable dwellings proposed.</li> <li>3. Responders want no more development without affordable housing - no more housing at prices locals cannot afford.</li> <li>4. Objection to developing green field (agricultural) sites when there are brown field sites in the county.</li> <li>5. The proposed areas form the gateway to the Wye Valley which attracts visitors.</li> <li>6. The proposed areas are in close proximity to ancient woodland and an AONB.</li> <li>7. Concerns that Chepstow, and the local area, is already subject to traffic congestion and high levels of air pollution.</li> <li>8. A responder states that Chepstow businesses are losing custom due to traffic problems.</li> <li>9. A responder states that MCCs Integrated Sustainability Appraisal makes it clear that development anywhere in Chepstow will make the current traffic and pollution issues worse.</li> <li>10. A responder states the annual objective level, in MCCs Local air management strategy, is being exceeded on Hardwick Hill.</li> <li>11. There should be no more building until a bypass is built from the Severn Bridge to Gloucestershire. Closure of a road for planned maintenance caused tailbacks from Highbeech to Lydney, Thornwell and across the Severn bridge.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Mathern Community Council, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. 16 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>12. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>13. Mathern Community Council</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12. Concerns that road access in any direction is unsuitable and unsafe.</li> <li>13. Mathern Community Council state that no public transport serves this site.</li> <li>14. A responder states that no shops or employment at this site.</li> <li>15. Concerns re poor broadband services and increased demand for schools, doctors and dentists.</li> <li>16. Planning proposals in Gloucestershire will also have a detrimental effect on Chepstow.</li> <li>17. A responder feels that more development at this site is excessive and will add to the general inability of Chepstow town to cope with more commuters who add nothing to the local economy.</li> <li>18. Concerns that drainage in the outfall area of this site (surface and foul) is overcapacity with Mounon being flooded via the brook annually and having raw sewage emitting from Manholes.</li> <li>19. Responders feel that infrastructure and service improvements would be necessary before any development at this site.</li> <li>20. Responders feel that development will ruin views of the area.</li> <li>21. CS0165 Mounon Road is a large site and nearer the motorway access and within walking distance of the town centre so appears to be a better option.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15. Mathern Community Council, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>16. 9 Private Individual</li> <li>17. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>18. 3 Private Individual</li> <li>19. Mathern Community Council, 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>20. Mathern Community Council, 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>21. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0054 West of Racecourse Roundabout, Chepstow</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Route of Roman roads in and adjacent to the site, buildings noted on historic mapping sequences to the north, condition for written scheme of investigation for mitigation in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>2. Objection to developing green field sites when there are brown field sites in the county.</li> <li>3. The proposed areas form the gateway to the Wye Valley which attracts visitors.</li> <li>4. Concerns re loss of views towards the Wye Valley.</li> <li>5. The proposed areas are in close proximity to ancient woodland and an AONB.</li> <li>6. Multiple protected species of bat and newt have habitats in the surrounding green spaces and use the site to transit and maintain their habitats.</li> <li>7. Agricultural land should not be used for housing.</li> <li>8. Concerns regarding the only access to the adjacent agricultural land being through the site offered for development.</li> <li>9. Concerns that Chepstow, and the local area, is already subject to traffic congestion, long queues, and high (illegal) levels of air pollution. Hardwick Hill and Highbeech roundabout are particular pinch points.</li> <li>10. Planning proposals in Gloucestershire will also have a detrimental effect on the traffic issues in Chepstow.</li> <li>11. Responders stated that MCCs Integrated Sustainability Appraisal makes it clear that development anywhere in Chepstow will make the current traffic and pollution issues worse. Development will contravene UK, National and local policies.</li> <li>12. There should be no more building until a bypass is built from the Severn Bridge to Gloucestershire. Closure of a road for planned maintenance caused tailbacks from Highbeech to Lydney, Thornwell and across the Severn bridge.</li> <li>13. A responder states that Chepstow businesses are losing custom due to traffic problems.</li> <li>14. Responders feel that the site is too far from public transport options, which are poor and cannot be relied upon to the meet the needs of a working population, and the area too steep for active travel.</li> <li>15. Responders feel that overdevelopment is having a detrimental effect on residents and visiting tourists.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 16 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>14. 9 Private Individuals</li> <li>15. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>16. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>17. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>18. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>19. 10 Private Individuals</li> <li>20. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>21. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>22. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>23. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>24. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<p>16. A responder states that the information presented does not identify the number, type or mix of dwellings/affordable dwellings proposed.</p> <p>17. Responder feels that the site would be better accessed from the Itton Road as there is a roundabout junction for that road with the A466.</p> <p>18. A responder feels that residential development would be poor use of the eastern part of this site; could be a visitor attraction or hotel if development is necessary.</p> <p>19. Concerns that existing community/public services are already overstretched. Infrastructure and service improvements would be necessary before any development at this site.</p> <p>20. Responders want no more development without affordable housing. No more housing at prices locals cannot afford.</p> <p>21. Concerns that there are no recreation or leisure facilities, nor green infrastructure included in the plans.</p> <p>22. Concerns regarding the proposed lake for surface water drainage and for the adequacy of sewage pumping facilities.</p> <p>23. Concerns regarding water run off and the impact of development on the water table.</p> <p>24. Support for the site having excellent road access, suitable crossings and pedestrian access to the town and local amenities.</p>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0098 Bayfield, Chepstow</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>2. Support for the site as long as development provides at least 50% affordable housing.</li> <li>3. The site promotor, Vistry, has submitted extensive information in support of the site and makes the following key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not subject to any fundamental constraints that cannot be mitigated.</li> <li>• The development proposals are designed in such a way that a green buffer can be maintained with Pwllmeyric ensuring no coalescence of these settlements.</li> <li>• The site is not located in an area at risk of flooding.</li> <li>• Around 13ha of green infrastructure will permeate the development and will include the retention and enhancement of the vast majority of woodland and boundary vegetation.</li> <li>• The Preliminary Transport Appraisal has identified an improvement scheme which would alleviate capacity constraints on the High Beech Roundabout; the proposed development could facilities the implementation of such a scheme.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Responders have support for the overall strategy but state that this site cannot be developed until the infrastructure within Chepstow to support it has been expanded.</li> <li>5. Responders state that no development should go ahead until a bypass has been provided.</li> <li>6. Objection to developing green field sites (with public rights of way) when there are brownfield sites in the county.</li> <li>7. Responders state that the proposed areas form the gateway to the Wye Valley which attracts visitors.</li> <li>8. Concerns that the site is in close proximity to an AONB.</li> <li>9. Responders state that the site is adjacent to an ancient woodland, used extensively by local people for leisure, and supports local, protected species such as deer, bats and birds of prey.</li> <li>10. Responders state that the site has acknowledged national landscape interest and would be entirely inappropriate for the site to be allocated for development.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Chepstow Town Council</li> <li>3. Vistry</li> <li>4. 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. 12 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. 20 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. 9 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Cllr Christopher Edwards, 54 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. 52 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. Cllr Christopher Edwards, 15 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 11 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Cllr Christopher Edwards, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>14. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Christopher Edwards, 83 Private Individuals</li> <li>15. 44 Private Individuals</li> <li>16. 27 Private Individuals</li> </ol>

<p>11. Responders feel that the development of the site would detract unacceptably from the wider AONB setting. The visual distinction between town and protected woodland would be lost forever.</p> <p>12. Responders state that the site is on prime agricultural land.</p> <p>13. Several responders feel that the site is sloping away from the main settlement, visually relating to the AONB rather than the town, and not being conducive to quality placemaking.</p> <p>14. Concerns that traffic congestion within Chepstow, particularly Highbeech roundabout and Hardwick Hill, is at unacceptable levels. Any incidents or planned closures cause excessive queues.</p> <p>15. Concerns re Chepstow being a Designated Air Quality Management Area with high, potentially illegal, levels of air pollution (contrary to Wellbeing of Future Generations Act).</p> <p>16. Development proposals in Gloucestershire, and the wider community, will impact traffic levels in Chepstow and demand for services.</p> <p>17. Responders feel that the site is at a dangerous location for pedestrians (no safe walking routes) and active travel routes are not viable.</p> <p>18. Responders feel that the B4235 is not suitable for heavy traffic and will be increasingly dangerous during construction and afterwards.</p> <p>19. Concerns that local infrastructure and services are already overstretched with no capacity to serve this site. Local roads are congested, public transport is poor, schools are oversubscribed, it's difficult to get a GP appointment, no spaces available at NHS dentists, no longer a local hospital facility. Shortage of leisure and community facilities and no cultural facilities such as a theatre or cinema.</p> <p>20. Responders feel that this site is farthest from the town centre and areas of local employment and involves steep walks back from the centre.</p> <p>21. Responders state that the site is far from public transport routes and no improvement in public transport recently. Lack of suitable services (no direct rail link to Bristol) as well as cost encourages driving.</p> <p>22. Concern that congestion is putting visitors off coming to Chepstow and supporting the shops and food outlets, resulting in a disappointing level of shopping.</p> <p>23. Responders want no more housing at prices that locals cannot afford.</p> <p>24. Concern that affordable housing will attract crime, drugs and other anti social behaviour.</p> <p>25. Concern that Chepstow is overdeveloped and will become a commuter town with no sense of community.</p> <p>26. Concerns regarding potential groundwater contamination, from construction, of the natural spring below the site.</p> <p>27. Concerns regarding potential flooding as currently significant throughflow of water through adjacent streets during heavy rainfall.</p> <p>28. Concerns that development in Chepstow has the potential to impact the River Wye SSSI and to impact the Wye Valley Woodlands SSSI/National Nature Reserve through atmospheric pollution.</p> <p>29. Concerns that development would affect the right to light as it would impact the solar generation of solar panelled properties.</p> <p>30. Responders state that the Council's Integrated Sustainability Appraisal makes it clear that development anywhere in Chepstow will make current traffic and pollution issues worse, with the (WeITAG) study demonstrating that the High Beech roundabout is already at full capacity.</p> <p>31. Concern that growth figures conflict with WG advice to limit number to a maximum of 4275 new houses and exceed this target by 40%.</p>	<p>17. Cllr Christopher Edwards, 21 Private Individual</p> <p>18. 4 Private Individuals</p> <p>19. Mathern Community Council, 76 Private Individuals</p> <p>20. Cllr Christopher Edwards, 40 Private Individuals</p> <p>21. Cllr Christopher Edwards, 44 Private Individuals</p> <p>22. 17 Private Individuals</p> <p>23. 10 Private Individuals</p> <p>24. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>25. 17 Private Individuals</p> <p>26. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>27. 13 Private Individuals</p> <p>28. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>29. 4 Private Individuals</p> <p>30. 16 Private Individuals</p> <p>31. 16 Private Individuals</p> <p>32. 6 Private Individuals</p> <p>33. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>34. 12 Private Individuals</p> <p>35. 12 Private Individuals</p> <p>36. 7 Private Individuals</p> <p>37. 10 Private Individuals</p>
---	--

	<p>32. Concern that the Council's aspirations for job created lack credibility.</p> <p>33. A responder feels that building near the Severn bridge will attract middle aged commuters from Bristol and South Gloucestershire rather than the young people needed to rebalance the County's demography.</p> <p>34. Responders state that recent Planning Application for the site has over 800 oppositions. Site also previously refused planning for reasons which are still valid.</p> <p>35. Criticism of the LDP process - re 2nd consultation so soon after 1st, this site being the preferred option whilst not scoring the best. Plans not aligned with WG policy.</p> <p>36. Responders ask why were only 7.5% of houses on the Fairfield Mabey site allocated for affordable on that brownfield site. Now MCC is saying this greenfield site is required for Affordable Housing.</p> <p>37. Concerns regarding provision of formal and informal open spaces and Green Infrastructure onsite - history of developers not delivering.</p>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0112 Land at St Lawrence Lane, Chepstow</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. The HER indicates the course of a Roman road passing through the south of the site, the potential site of a medieval Grange, and findspots of both Roman and Medieval date. Desk-based assessment and geo-physical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. The site promotor, Vistry, has submitted extensive information in support of the site and makes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not subject to any fundamental constraints that cannot be mitigated.</li> <li>• The proposals will maximise opportunities for active travel with a network of well connected pedestrian and cycle links that also have the advantage of providing enhanced sustainable links between Pwllmeyric and Chepstow.</li> <li>• The development proposals are designed in such a way that a green buffer can be maintained with Pwllmeyric ensuring no coalescence of these settlements.</li> <li>• The site is not located in an area at risk of flooding.</li> <li>• The Preliminary Transport Appraisal has identified an improvement scheme which would alleviate capacity constraints on the High Beech Roundabout; the proposed development could facilitate the implementation of such a scheme.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Responders state that a green wedge between Chepstow and Pwllmeyric is essential (to help retain their own identities) so would not support the development of CS0112.</li> <li>4. Objection to developing Green field sites when there are brownfield sites within the county.</li> <li>5. Responders state that the site is on prime agricultural land.</li> <li>6. Responders state that the proposed areas form the gateway to the Wye Valley which attracts visitors. Development would ruin views of the AONB.</li> <li>7. A responder feels that development would have a detrimental effect on the wildlife that currently resides in the area and hedgerows.</li> <li>8. Responders feel that green spaces enjoyed by the community should not be built on.</li> <li>9. Responders state that no development should go ahead until a bypass has been provided and substantial improvements to Highbeech roundabout.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Vistry</li> <li>3. Chepstow Town Council, Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown, 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Mathern Community Council, 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. 11 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. Cllr Louise Brown, 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. Cllr Louise Brown, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown, 15</li> <li>12. Mathern Community Council, 9</li> <li>13. 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>14. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown, 14</li> <li>15. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

<p>10. Concerns that access onto the A48 here would be dangerous and difficult to use due to queuing traffic.</p> <p>11. Concerns that traffic congestion within Chepstow, particularly Highbeech roundabout and Hardwick Hill, is at unacceptable levels. Any incidents or planned closures cause excessive queues.</p> <p>12. Concerns that Chepstow is a Designated Air Quality Management Area with high, potentially illegal, levels of air pollution (contrary to Wellbeing of Future Generations Act).</p> <p>13. Development in Gloucestershire, and the wider community, impacts traffic levels in Chepstow and demand for services.</p> <p>14. Concerns that local infrastructure and services are already overstretched with no capacity to serve this site. Local roads are congested, public transport is poor, schools are oversubscribed, it's difficult to get a GP appointment, no spaces available at NHS dentists, no longer a local hospital facility. Shortage of leisure and community facilities and no cultural facilities such as a theatre or cinema.</p> <p>15. Concerns that the plans don't include any additional recreation or leisure facilities. What Green Infrastructure will be included?</p> <p>16. Responders feel that affordable housing is needed but no evidence of this being supplied on current developments. The only housing that should be built in the area should be Affordable for local workers only.</p> <p>17. Responders state that the plan suggests working from home will continue but evidence suggests people are returning to the workplace.</p> <p>18. Concern re lack of plans to increase employment in the area. Workers currently employed in the area do not earn enough to be able to afford the properties being built.</p> <p>19. Responders state that site is far from the town centre, and areas of local employment, and involves steep walks back from the centre.</p> <p>20. Responders state that site is far from public transport routes and no improvement in public transport recently. Lack of suitable services (no direct rail link to Bristol) as well as cost encourages driving.</p> <p>21. Concern that there is no provision for safe walking and Active Travel routes.</p> <p>22. Concern that Chepstow is overdeveloped and will become a commuter town with no sense of community.</p> <p>23. Congestion is putting visitors off coming to Chepstow and supporting the shops and food outlets, resulting in a disappointing level of shopping.</p> <p>24. Concerns that the sewage system on Pwllmeyric Hill has significant impact on mountain stream with regular raw sewage outfall in the river.</p> <p>25. Concerns that the land floods frequently.</p> <p>26. Plan claims houses will be built as net carbon zero ready, however, no recent developments have been built to the high environmental standards we can now achieve.</p> <p>27. Responders state that the Council's Integrated Sustainability Appraisal makes it clear that development anywhere in Chepstow will make current traffic and pollution issues worse, with the (WeITAG) study demonstrating that the High Beech roundabout is already at full capacity.</p> <p>28. Concern that growth figures conflict with WG advice to limit number to a maximum of 4275 new houses and exceed this target by 40%.</p>	<p>16. 5 Private Individuals</p> <p>17. 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>18. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>19. 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>20. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>21. 5 Private Individuals</p> <p>22. 4 Private Individuals</p> <p>23. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>24. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>25. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>26. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>27. 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>28. 2 Private Individuals</p>
---	--

<b>Candidate Site: CS0154 Land to the north of M48, Chepstow</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues. Existing disturbance from M4 construction and landscaping.</li> <li>2. Support for the site as it's near the motorway and bring additional employment to the area.</li> <li>3. Concern that development would erode the green wedge between Mathern and Bulwark.</li> <li>4. Objection to developing Green field sites when there are brownfield sites within the county.</li> <li>5. A responder feels that the green belt around Chepstow, which contains a well used public footpath, would be compromised.</li> <li>6. Responders state that the proposed areas form the gateway to the Wye Valley which attracts visitors. Development would ruin views of the AONB.</li> <li>7. A responders feels that no development should go ahead until a bypass has been provided and substantial improvements to High Beech roundabout.</li> <li>8. Concerns that access to the site will be difficult and dangerous for pedestrians.</li> <li>9. Concerns that traffic congestion within Chepstow, particularly Highbeech roundabout and Hardwick Hill, is at unacceptable levels. Any incidents or planned closures cause excessive queues.</li> <li>10. Concerns that Chepstow is a Designated Air Quality Management Area with high, potentially illegal, levels of air pollution.</li> <li>11. Development in Gloucestershire, and the wider community, impacts traffic levels in Chepstow and demand for services.</li> <li>12. Concerns that local infrastructure and services are already overstretched with no capacity to serve this site. Local roads are congested, public transport is poor, schools are oversubscribed, it's difficult to get a GP appointment, no spaces available at NHS dentists, no longer a local hospital facility. Shortage of leisure and community facilities and no cultural facilities such as a theatre or cinema.</li> <li>13. Responders state that there is no public transport serving the site.</li> <li>14. Responders state that the Council's Integrated Sustainability Appraisal makes it clear that development anywhere in Chepstow will make current traffic and pollution issues worse, with the (WeITAG) study demonstrating that the Highbeech roundabout is already at full capacity.</li> <li>15. Cllr Louise Brown questions whether there is need for further hotel accommodation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 9 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. Cllr Louise Brown</li> <li>8. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>12. Mathern Community Council, 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>13. Mathern Community Council, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. Cllr Louise Brown</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0260 South of J2 M48 (Option 1: Hotel &amp; Employment)</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Objection to developing greenfield sites when brownfield sites are available in the county.</li> <li>3. Concern that the proposed areas form part of the gateway to the Wye Valley, which attracts visitors, and the areas are close to an AONB.</li> <li>4. Concern for the impact the increase in traffic will have on Chepstow which is already suffering from traffic congestion and high levels of air pollution.</li> <li>5. Planning proposals in Gloucestershire will have a detrimental effect on Chepstow.</li> <li>6. Responders state that public transport is not a viable option for many people – buses are infrequent and stop early and there are no direct trains to Bristol increasing use of the car.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 4 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 2 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 2 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 4 Private Individuals</li> </ol>

	7. Support for the site due to it's location close to the motorway and for the additional employment it may bring.	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0261 South of J2 M48 (Option 2: Petrol Station, Drive Thru and Employment)</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Objection to developing greenfield sites when brownfield sites are available in the county.</li> <li>3. Concern that the proposed areas form part of the gateway to the Wye Valley, which attracts visitors, and the areas are close to an AONB.</li> <li>4. Concern for the impact the increase in traffic will have on Chepstow which is already suffering from traffic congestion and high levels of air pollution.</li> <li>5. Planning proposals in Gloucestershire will have a detrimental effect on Chepstow.</li> <li>6. Responders state that public transport is not a viable option for many people – buses are infrequent and stop early and there are no direct trains to Bristol increasing use of the car.</li> <li>7. Responder states that there are already 3 petrol stations in Chepstow so another is not needed.</li> <li>8. Concerns that a drive through would only increase traffic, pollution and littering.</li> <li>9. Support for the site due to it's location close to the motorway and for the additional employment it may bring.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 4 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 2 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 2 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 4 Private Individuals</li> </ol>
<b>Monmouth</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0006 Land at Osbaston Road</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0051 Land at Croft y Bwla</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0074 Land rear of The Royal Oak</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0076 West of Rockfield Road, Monmouth</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Responder does not support the filtering out of the site due to CIRIA SuDS information released and to view their formal representations for further information.	1. Hallam Land Management Ltd.
<b>Candidate Site: CS0078 Croft y Bwla Farm, Monmouth</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Responder does not support the filtering out of the site due to CIRIA SuDS information released and to view their formal representations and Brookbanks Nutrient Neutrality Assessment for further information.</li> <li>2. Responder provides a summary of their Nutrient Neutrality Assessment. The summary notes that proposals for 300 dwellings at the site can be self-sufficient in becoming Nutrient Neutral in line with NRW guidance.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Taylor Wimpey</li> <li>2. Taylor Wimpey</li> <li>3. Taylor Wimpey</li> </ol>

	3. The summary states that the proposed development will result in a positive TP budget that will require mitigation to be delivered, the summary includes mitigation proposals as such: Proposed SuDS features for surface water runoff, foul water discharge treatment and a constructed wetland suggested to treat effluent.	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0099 Land at Drybridge Farm</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0136 Land at former Poultry Units at Rockfield Road</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0151 Former Troy Rail Yard, Monmouth</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Responder notes the history of promotion of the site through the previous stages of the RLDP process, and the recommendation for the site not to progress to the next stage as the site is in the Upper River Wye catchment area, requires an FCA complying with the new TAN15 guidelines, and relates to a brownfield site development that is not permitted in area of Zone 3.</li> <li>2. Responder acknowledges the Preferred Strategy seeks to make no new allocations but believes provisions should be made for delivering sustainable growth across the entire plan period and beyond. Responder quotes Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11) reaffirming that planning authorities should take the lead on previously developed land, considering and identifying the interventions necessary to assist in its delivery.</li> <li>3. Responder provides a completed FCA for the site compliant with the new TAN15 guidelines. Responder notes the site is at risk of flooding from Zone 2 and Zone 3 but that no developments will be proposed in the areas at risk. There is a marginal surface water and small watercourse risk present in parts of the site, but these are outside of the property and site access routes, therefore complying with TAN15 guidelines. The development will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere as adequate attenuation will be designed for events up to and including the 1-in-100yr, and a foul pumping station will be used to manage foul flows which will be positioned outside of flood Zone 2 and Zone 3.</li> <li>4. Responder believes the site should be incorporated into the settlement boundary of Monmouth.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0189 Land at Tudor Road, Monmouth</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant progress has been made on technical work and investigating a resolution to the phosphate constraint in Monmouth, by site promoter and responder Edenstone, noting that pre-application negotiations have taken place.</li> <li>2. Through pre-application and candidate site submissions, Edenstone believe their client demonstrates that a scheme for 58 dwellings can be delivered successfully.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Edenstone</li> <li>2. Edenstone</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0216 Land at Hereford Road</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0271 Land at Vauxhall Fields</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0272 Land at former Poultry Units at Rockfield Road</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	



<b>Candidate Site: CS0274 Land North of Wonastow Road, Monmouth</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Richborough Estates, the site promoter, confirms through the council's high-level assessment that the site is not subject to any fundamental constraints that cannot be mitigated.</li> <li>2. Part of the site is subject to surface water flooding, but developments would mitigate this issue and improve drainage, resulting in a downstream benefit through a reduction in peak flow run-off.</li> <li>3. The site is shown, through the high-level assessment, to not be compatible due to its location within the Upper River Wye catchment area. If the council's position on phosphates change, the responder believes the site represents the most appropriate direction for future growth.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Richborough Estates</li> <li>2. Richborough Estates</li> <li>3. Richborough Estates</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0275 Land off Wonastow Road Industrial Estate</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0277 Land at Drewen Farm, Monmouth</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Responder and developer of the site, Vistry Group, is in favour of the site and welcomes the development due to its partial inclusion in the adopted LDP and vicinity to a wide range of amenities that support the development.</li> <li>2. Vistry Group has undertaken a range of initial surveys to inform the design proposals for the site and concluded that the site will be a viable and deliverable proposition.</li> <li>3. Responder believes once the phosphates challenge has been overcome at Monmouth, the delivery of the site will provide a valuable contribution towards the housing needs of the county.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vistry Group</li> <li>2. Vistry Group</li> <li>3. Vistry Group</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0292 Rhossili, Hadnock Road</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received	
<b>Caerwent</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0009 Former MoD Training Centre, Caerwent</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. The site promoter states that the site is located on previously developed land.</li> <li>3. Concerns regarding the provision of Doctors, Dentists, Telephone and Broadband.</li> <li>4. Concerns regarding the provision of Primary and Secondary school places.</li> <li>5. Concerns regarding the adequacy of sewage processing.</li> <li>6. Concerns regarding surface water run off causing flooding.</li> <li>7. The flood plains provide a natural reserve for wildfowl and such habitat loss would impact a SSSI</li> <li>8. Poor local bus services with no service in the evening or on Sundays.</li> <li>9. Better train service from Caldicot required plus a bus link to the station.</li> <li>10. Concerns regarding an increase in traffic locally plus on the M4 and A48 around Larkfield, Chepstow.</li> <li>11. Further development will destroy the look and feel of these peaceful rural villages.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Edenstone</li> <li>3. 2 Private individuals</li> <li>4. 1 Private individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private individual</li> <li>6. 2 Private individuals</li> <li>7. 1 Private individual</li> <li>8. 1 Private individual</li> <li>9. 1 Private individual</li> <li>10. 2 Private individuals</li> <li>11. 1 Private individual</li> </ol>

<b>Candidate Site: CS0017 Village Farm, Caerwent</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Site c35m north of the Scheduled Monument of 13th century Llanfair Discoed Castle MM047, Roman finds recorded in the vicinity. Development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0071 Land at Slough Farm, Caerwent</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work</li> <li>2. Landscape sensitivity to residential development is high/medium.</li> <li>3. The area is classified as predictive grade 1 BMV land.</li> <li>4. The site is located a significant distance from all day to day services and responders are concerned that there is sufficient provision of services including Doctors, Dentists, Telephone, Broadband and school places.</li> <li>5. The site's relationship with the green belt designated under Policy 34 of Future Wales is also a consideration.</li> <li>6. Concern regarding underlying water courses and the risk of sink holes.</li> <li>7. Concerns re flooding and water run off entering the nearby SSSI and the danger of pollution of the SSSI by grey water.</li> <li>8. A responder states that the Nedern valley should be preserved as a green biodiversity corridor of significance as recognised by the SSSI.</li> <li>9. Concerns regarding the adequacy of sewage processing.</li> <li>10. Poor local bus services with no service in the evening or on Sundays.</li> <li>11. Better train service from Caldicot required plus a bus link to the station.</li> <li>12. Concerns re an increase in traffic.</li> <li>13. Further development will destroy the look and feel of these peaceful rural villages of Crick and Caerwent.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Edenstone plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Edenstone</li> <li>4. Edenstone plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Edenstone</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 2 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Caldicot</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0007 Pill Row, Caldicot</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Responder notes that employment land adjacent to Pill Row and Severn Bridge Industrial Estate has been omitted. An existing planning application has been submitted and First Investments is providing answers to questions for the Planning Committee in the coming months.</li> <li>2. Owner of land adjacent to Pill Row has concerns re their land not being taken up as a candidate site for employment, when First Investments, who submitted their land, has had their site - land adjacent to Severn Bridge Industrial Estate – designated in the existing LDP. Responder requests that their land is included in the revised LDP as a candidate site for employment.</li> <li>3. FI Real Estate Management Ltd strongly object to the removal of the site through the High-Level Assessment to progress to Stage 3A. FIREM object to the methodology in the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology that has been applied, disagreeing that the site cannot be mitigated for flood risk and that there should be an allowance to use a current planning application as evidence as part of the sieving exercise.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Private Individual x 1</li> <li>2. Private Individual x 1</li> <li>3. FI Real Estate Management Ltd</li> <li>4. FI Real Estate Management Ltd</li> <li>5. FI Real Estate Management Ltd</li> </ol>

	<p>4. FIREM note that the proposed changes to TAN15 relate to providing a more flexible approach with regard to less vulnerable development, such as employment use, and believe this Candidate Site, and potentially others, should be carried forward into Stage 3A assessment. Because of the proposed changes, FIREM believe the Council should pause to allow the process to catch-up and revise the Methodology to re-run the assessments and should include a more flexible interpretation of the site opportunities that land, such as CS0007, can play for future development when the site benefits from flood defences.</p> <p>5. In the view of FIREM, the associated evidence of the Employment Land Report Update would realise a different outcome to assessment of Policy SAE1h and retention of the employment land allocation.</p>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0067 East &amp; West Church Road, Caldicot</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – A previous response to pre-planning consultation recommended desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include pre-determination work; our understanding of the site has not changed since then, and our recommendation remains the same.</p>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</p>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0129 Dewstow Village, Former Dewstow Golf Course</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – A previous response to the LDP consultation recommended desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work; our understanding of the site has not changed since then, and recommendation remains the same.</p> <p>2. Site promoter provides support for the Dewstow Village site noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site has capacity for 580 to 815 homes that could be delivered over a number of phases.</li> <li>• If the upper number of homes were progressed the scheme would also be able to support a local centre and an employment work hub.</li> <li>• Masterplan submitted identifies access routes through the site and access for vehicles.</li> <li>• Site has benefits of existing rights of way and links that can be enhanced with good access to primary schools.</li> <li>• Opportunity to locate outdoor play space as well as areas of sustainable urban drainage.</li> <li>• Comprises two land parcels offering flexibility in delivery and quantum of development.</li> </ul>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</p> <p>2. Redrow Homes</p>
<b>Crick</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0091 Caerwent Depot, Crick</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as AMBER – Whilst the site has been disturbed by its former use, the route of a Roman road is adjacent to the site, and a Scheduled Monument (MM151 Crick Round Barrow), a burial mound is 100m W, development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</p> <p>2. Concerns re drainage, flooding, and sewerage in the area. Crick has no mains drainage system and flooding of nearby fields and properties has occurred in the recent past due to surface run off. The Crick Brook is already considered to have a flood plain within the hamlet environs and has recently caused flooding, making it unsuitable for additional water disposal. Carefully considered SuDs</p>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</p> <p>2. 6 Private Individuals</p> <p>3. 6 Private Individuals</p> <p>4. 5 Private Individuals</p> <p>5. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>6. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>7. 4 Private Individuals</p>

<p>will need to find reliable means to deal with surface water drainage and deal with site constraints. Without introducing a sewer system to Crick, the treated effluent from a development of this size cannot be dealt with, even with an on onsite sewage treatment plant (STP). An existing STP from the nursing home discharged into Crick Brook repeatedly fails to function effectively, therefore increasing concern for a development of this size. Distance from site to drainage point, sewage system and watercourse, dramatically reduces feasibility of the site. Developing on this site will greatly intensify existing issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Concerns re road infrastructure, traffic, and access. Significant changes to the current access will be required in order to maintain the safety of residents and visitors entering and leaving the site. Due to current and newly completed developments the area has seen a significant increase in traffic, with motorist opting to use smaller alternate routes increasing traffic in those areas. Current roads infrastructure already struggling, therefore new routes will worsen the issue causing children to be late for school, commuters late for work and an increase in pollution. Lack of amenities in the area increases traffic. Responders concerned that there is no obvious engineering solution to the issues faced. Concerns that a large proportion of residents buying homes in the new developments will be commuters to Bristol, increasing traffic and producing very little benefit to the Welsh economy.</li> <li>4. Local services such as telephone, broadband, schools, doctors, dentists, and other NHS services are at max capacity, oversubscribed and have huge waiting lists, therefore an increase in residents will only worsen issues. Concerns that there have been no provisions made to improve these facilities.</li> <li>5. Responders concern re the lack of amenities and local facilities to service the residents in the existing area, expecting worsening conditions after new developments. Public Transport in Crick is poor, running infrequently and not at times needed by those who commute. Service provisions will need to be made to facilitate this development. Responders concerned as Public Transport is not sufficient enough for day-to-day needs, yet they're being encouraged to reduce car usage in favour of Public Transport.</li> <li>6. Concern re the scale of the proposed development which would double the number of dwellings, impacting on the nature and character of the hamlet. Chepstow and the surrounding areas have been extensively developed, responders noting that these developments will represent the urbanisation of rural settlements, subsuming Crick into Caldicot. Responders object to the change in character which runs counter to the principals of Future Wales 2040.</li> <li>7. Responders note that the Crick Brook flows directly into the Nedern wetland area of SSSI status. Concern re additional housing in the area reducing green open space and countryside. The floodplains affecting the site provide a natural reserve for wildfowl, therefore development would lead to habitat loss and impact on the SSSI.</li> <li>8. Responders note lack of jobs in the local area.</li> <li>9. Concern that proposed net zero developments and the increased use of electric vehicles will not be enough to prevent the developments from having an effect on nature, flooding, and the general health of those who live in the area.</li> <li>10. Responder notes that the site has had much contamination over the area and would need substantial clearing and cleaning.</li> <li>11. Responder supports site of previously developed land in Crick.</li> <li>12. Site Promoters for Land South of Newport Road, Magor, Edenstone, note the site to be located on previously developed land and are against development for the following reasons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abnormal costs associated with the delivery of the site owing to it being previously developed.</li> <li>• The site's location adjacent to Crick is far less sustainable when compared to other location in Severnside.</li> <li>• It is noted that whilst previously developed land should be prioritised above greenfield land when allocating sites, it is not considered sound to prioritise brownfield land which is far less sustainably located when compared with sustainably located greenfield sites such as the Land South of Newport Road, Magor.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>12. Edenstone</li> </ol>
--	---

Magor with Undy		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0038 Land to the west of Wales One Business Park, Magor</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd
<b>Candidate Site: CS0206 South of Newport Road, Magor</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. Geophysical survey in 2008 on part of the site identified potential archaeological features.</li> <li>2. The site sponsor, Edenstone, have submitted extensive information and state that the development will provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range and choice of housing (including market housing, affordable housing and potential for bungalows) along with a care home.</li> <li>• Good quality open spaces, trim trails and community allotments for the benefit of existing and proposed residents.</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure with biodiversity benefits (delivering a biodiversity enhancement).</li> <li>• Economic benefits as the proposed development will generate jobs and create additional tax revenue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. A responder states that the site is a valuable green space which has been used by the community to walk dogs for well over 20 years; around 100 dogs use this field on a daily basis.</li> <li>4. A responder feels that local leisure facilities are already inadequate for the current population.</li> <li>5. Concerns that health services cannot cope with a further increase in population considering the new developments at Vinegar Hill, Portskewett and Caldicot as well.</li> <li>6. Concerns that local schools are full/close to capacity.</li> <li>7. Concerns re public transport; the local bus service is infrequent, with no link to Severn Tunnel station and no buses on a Sunday. The walkway train station at Magor is needed.</li> <li>8. Concerns re parking in Magor village particularly during school drop off/pick times. This site is too far from the schools for Key Stage 1 children to walk to.</li> <li>9. Traffic concerns as any incident on the M4 has a severe impact as any traffic trying to leave the village cannot move.</li> <li>10. Flooding and excess surface water on the site is also a cause for concern. Improvements have been made but still the field is under water at times.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Edenstone</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0211 Land at Rockfield Road, Undy</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd

<b>Candidate Site: CS0228 Land off Green Moor Lane, Magor</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concerns regarding increase in traffic during construction and afterwards. Lorries already cause problems blocking the entrance to Llandevenny Lane.</li> <li>3. Concerns regarding noise and lights during construction and when site in use.</li> <li>4. Concerns regarding flooding as responder currently has issues with flooding coming off the land.</li> <li>5. Responder states that screening would be needed to block out development.</li> <li>6. Concerns for the diverse wildlife currently in the area.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0258 Quay Point (Land south of Magor Brewery)</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concerns re the siting of a Hydrogen Plant close to a dwelling.</li> <li>3. Concerns regarding increase in traffic during construction and afterwards. Lorries already cause problems blocking the entrance to Llandevenny Lane.</li> <li>4. Concerns regarding noise and lights during construction and when site in use.</li> <li>5. Concerns regarding flooding as responder currently has issues with flooding coming off the land.</li> <li>6. Responder states that screening would be needed to block out development.</li> <li>7. Concerns for the diverse wildlife currently in the area.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Rogiet</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0168 Adjacent to Merlin Close, Rogiet</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. The HER notes a coin hoard of Roman date was found within the area, and remains of a Roman building excavated adjacent to the site, and a well to the south. An archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. The site promotor, Manor Farm Partnership, makes the following supporting comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We believe this site is technically deliverable, viable and developable, meeting the requirements of the Preferred Strategy.</li> <li>• We believe the site could potentially be delivered subject to a suitable flood consequence assessment report.</li> <li>• The site would provide 50% affordable housing, enhance active travel links, provide green open space for public access and provide a high quality settlement edge.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Concerns regarding mineral resources – the site is currently constrained by mineral safeguarding.</li> <li>4. Responders state that the site has been graded as 1 for BMV agricultural land.</li> <li>5. Responders state that the site is currently classified as a Green Wedge constraining any development. The site also adjoins an existing conservation area as designated in the current LDP.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd plus 17 Private Individual</li> <li>2. Manor Farm Partnership</li> <li>3. 19 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 19 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 20 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 18 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 7 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 2 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 5 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. A responder states that Great Crested Newts have been seen in the area, as recently as 2022 (video evidence may be available)</li> <li>7. Concerns that the site is classified, by NRW, as adjoining an area at risk of flooding from rivers and sea and the site itself is a high surface water risk.</li> <li>8. Concerns regarding ever increasing traffic issues, noise and pollution levels which would have a negative impact on the peaceful village of Rogiet.</li> <li>9. General objection to the site being included in the LDP and the affect development would have on the separation between Rogiet and Undy as well as the visual impact.</li> <li>10. Concerns regarding access to services and amenities such as dentists, medical care, shops, pubs and school places; few services are provided within Rogiet requiring residents to travel to other villages.</li> <li>11. Concerns that the site is significantly higher that the adjacent houses; any development would block natural light and affect privacy and enjoyment of those homes.</li> <li>12. General support for additional development around Rogiet.</li> </ol>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0253 Ifton Manor (Site A), Rogiet</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Responder states that this land is agricultural for farming and grazing livestock.</li> <li>3. Responder states that the land is used by the community for walking and exercise (both for residents and pets).</li> <li>4. Concerns that this 'green wedge' is the final distinction between Rogiet and Caldicot and development would see the smaller village subsumed by the larger town.</li> <li>5. Traffic concerns as the B4245 is the only route through the village and subject to long delays when incidents happen on the network; adding more homes will create even more reliance on this single point of failure.</li> <li>6. Environment/biodiversity concerns as this area supports a vast array of local wildlife, some of which is endangered. It also serves as a release site for Hedgehog Helpline Cymru and is developing a healthy population of this endangered species.</li> <li>7. Responders raise concerns over the history of flooding of the area which often renders the site impassable with several feet of water in places. This flooding can reach within metres of existing properties so there are concerns over the impact development would have on the flooding risk to these homes. Photographs submitted as evidence.</li> <li>8. The site promotor, Taylor Wimpey PLC (Savills), has submitted extensive information to support the site and makes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a clear aspiration, from WG and MCC, to deliver an improved vehicular linkage from either the B4245 and/or the M48 to Severn Tunnel Junction Railway Station and the indicative masterplan makes an allowance for land to provide this.</li> <li>• The site is considered to have 'High' value in terms of ecological connectivity but the site does not meet the tests for Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation and is suitable for development in part, however, extensive portions of the site cannot be developed due to flood risk so would be used for biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement.</li> <li>• With regards to Active travel in a Transport Note, prepared by TPA, Ifton Manor Farm performs considerably stronger than Caldicot Eastwith regards to proximity to services, accessibility by public transport and connectivity to the existing active travel network.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. Edenstone plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. Edenstone plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. Taylor Wimpey PLC (Savills)</li> <li>9. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<p>9. A responder states that this additional strategic delivery will offset the scaling back of CS0251 to deliver overall housing need.</p> <p>10. A responder states that the plan is silent on a new motorway junction on the M48 to link to STJ. The plan should set out clear support for this infrastructure and lobby WG accordingly.</p> <p>11. A responder requests that car parking spaces per dwelling are reduced from 3 to 2 so as not to re-enforce reliance on the car.</p>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0254 Ifton Manor (Site B), Rogiet</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Responder states that this land is agricultural for farming and grazing livestock.</li> <li>3. Responder states that the land is used by the community for walking and exercise (both for residents and pets).</li> <li>4. Concerns that this 'green wedge' is the final distinction between Rogiet and Caldicot and development would see the smaller village subsumed by the larger town.</li> <li>5. Traffic concerns as the B4245 is the only route through the village and subject to long delays when incidents happen on the network; adding more homes will create even more reliance on this single point of failure.</li> <li>6. Environment/biodiversity concerns as this area supports a vast array of local wildlife, some of which is endangered. It also serves as a release site for Hedgehog Helpline Cymru and is developing a healthy population of this endangered species.</li> <li>7. Responders raise concerns over the history of flooding of the area which often renders the site impassable with several feet of water in places. This flooding can reach within metres of existing properties so there are concerns over the impact development would have on the flooding risk to these homes. Photographs submitted as evidence.</li> <li>8. The site promotor, Taylor Wimpey PLC (Savills), has submitted extensive information to support the site and makes the following key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a clear aspiration, from WG and MCC, to deliver an improved vehicular linkage from either the B4245 and/or the M48 to Severn Tunnel Junction Railway Station and the indicative masterplan makes an allowance for land to provide this.</li> <li>• The site is considered to have 'High' value in terms of ecological connectivity but the site does not meet the tests for Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation and is suitable for development in part, however, extensive portions of the site cannot be developed due to flood risk so would be used for biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement.</li> <li>• With regards to Active travel in a Transport Note, prepared by TPA, Ifton Manor Farm performs considerably stronger than Caldicot East with regards to proximity to services, accessibility by public transport and connectivity to the existing active travel network.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. Edenstone plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. Edenstone plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. Taylor Wimpey PLC (Savills)</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0255 Land adj Ifton Industrial Estate, Rogiet</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. HER notes human remains found at the quarry in the west of the estate, archaeological mitigation in the estate has not encountered any further archaeological deposits. The area is disturbed and if necessary, dependent on the changes, development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> </ol>



<b>Candidate Site: CS0256 The Paddocks, Adj Rogiet Pool</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd

## Secondary Settlements

<b>Penperlleni</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0037 South Usk Rd, Penperlleni</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red - Desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Support for the site (along with CS0280) stating the development is capable of sitting comfortably within its landscape setting with the Council's Landscape Sensitivity Study identifying the site as having the lowest landscape sensitivity of all of the candidate sites submitted in Penperlleni.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Edenstone</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0138 Land at Goytre Farm, Penperlleni</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red - The HER notes an area of agricultural estate management. An archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Support for the site as Penperlleni within the Preferred Strategy is highlighted as a Tier 2 secondary settlement. The settlements proximity to the A4042/Usk Road ensures convenient access to the services, amenities and employment. The village is well catered for in terms of local amenities, services and buses to Newport, Cwmbran and Abergavenny which are all located within a short walk. The representor concludes that the site lies in a sustainable settlement that is not located within the Upper River Wye Catchment Area and is not impacted by the implications of the TAN15 flood map and states that there are no designations that cannot be carefully mitigated and accommodated for.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Persimmon Homes East Wales</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0217 Land at Fairfield, Penperlleni</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red - The HER notes the site of a potential Medieval Manor house and possible remains. An archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd

<b>Candidate Site: CS0279 Land West of Usk Road, Penperlleni</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red - The HER notes the site of a potential Medieval mill, channel, and other possible remains. An archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. The site promotor, Barratt and David Wilson Homes South Wales, has submitted extensive information in support of the site and make the following pointse: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of the site is grassland which is considered in their Preliminary Ecological Appraisal to be of low ecological value.</li> <li>• The Flood Risk and Drainage Advice Note submitted previously concludes that the site is within Flood Zone 1 for Rivers and Sea and that development for housing is acceptable within this flood zone.</li> <li>• MCC's Environmental Health Assessment concludes that development of the site, for housing, is acceptable from an environmental health perspective.</li> <li>• MCC's Active Travel Assessment concludes that the site is suitable to be developed from an active travel perspective.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Barratt and David Wilson Homes South Wales</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0280 Land at Walnut Tree Farm, Penperlleni</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red - The HER notes the site of a potential early post-Medieval farmhouse and outbuildings shown on the Tithe of 1838. An archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. The site promotor, Edenstone, has submitted extensive information in support of the site. Key points include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is sustainably located and could help to deliver the Council's 20 minute neighbourhood aspirations.</li> <li>• The site is close to the village centre and could encourage and support active travel travel.</li> <li>• The Council's Landscape Sensitivity Study identified the site as have the lowest landscape sensitivity of the candidate sites in Penperlleni.</li> <li>• On the basis of the technical assessments undertaken to date the promotor states that there are not considered to be any unresolvable constraints to the proposed development of the site.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Edenstone</li> </ol>

## Raglan

<b>Candidate Site: CS0069 Raglan Enterprise Park</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – Previous responses to consultation recommended desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work; our understanding of the site has not changed since then, and recommendation stays the same.</li> <li>2. Responder in support of the site as its scale is appropriate for the village and the development would contribute to climate change initiatives and increase local employment. However, much care should be given to the development so that it meets its goals in relation to; future needs, community, environment, sustainability, and traffic production, otherwise consideration will be given to its objection.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trist Ltd</li> <li>2. Raglan Community Council</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Responder believes expansion of existing commercial estate at Little Castle Farm site would be more proactive, than allocating a new site to develop on prime agricultural land. CS0278 would be a better site for the development due to its access. Acknowledgment that site CS0278 is outside of village envelope but believes this is more important for residential sites not employment sites and is positive about the prospect of employment opportunities.</li> <li>4. Responder objects to site and any other applications due to the delay in development of a previous 45 dwelling council approved residential site in Raglan.</li> </ol>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0183 South of Monmouth Road, Raglan</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as AMBER – Subsequent to an archaeological desk-based assessment, geophysical survey, and archaeological field evaluation, for a previous submission in the planning process, due to evidence of Medieval activity within the area, it was, and remains, our opinion, that development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>2. Raglan Community council believe the development of this site would lead to an unacceptable loss of agricultural land and would damage the high-quality historical landscape important to conservation areas, the castle, and residents for recreation.</li> <li>3. Concerns re unsustainable transport and commuting impacts, safety re the increase in traffic movement, and congestion in the village centre, which is not aided by the approved application for 45 residential dwellings.</li> <li>4. Concerns re the number of housing units allocated to Raglan. Responder believes the site's scale to be out of proportion with the existing village. If it is not economical to develop a site below 120 units, then the responder believes the previously approved 45 dwellings should be annulled.</li> <li>5. Responder believes CS0205 to be a natural expansion of the village down to its natural boundary of the Wilcae River, and a better fit.</li> <li>6. Responder and site promotor, Richborough Estates, are in full support of the site for residential allocation. The responders state that there are no fundamental constraints with the site, but note that the council require an FCA to support any application, which they believe due to previous attempts of development on the site will be overcome, as flooding risks can be mitigated with scheme design/ planning condition, and that the development of the site would result in a downstream benefit through a reduction in peak flow run-off, improving future resilience.</li> <li>7. Richborough Estates maintain that the development will not only bring forward new residential development and a significant amount of public open space, but also the potential to accommodate community uses, to be determined at a later date based on local needs. An area of 0.2 ha is set aside as part of the scheme for community use.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Raglan Community Council</li> <li>3. Raglan Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. Richborough Estates</li> <li>7. Richborough Estates</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0205 Land at Usk Road, Raglan</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – Previous response to consultation recommended desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work; our understanding of the site has not changed since then, and recommendation remains the same.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Raglan Community Council</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Responder supports the allocation of the site as the developable area of the site is modest and more in scale with Raglan's needs. As the site is not extendable, it will round the village off to the natural boundary of the brook. The site is also accessible and safe for commuting.</li> <li>3. Concerns re volume of residential development being allocated to Raglan and believes the existing 45 units allocated should be annulled.</li> <li>4. Responder believes the site would be a natural extension of the village down to its boundary of the river, having good access without impacting congestion.</li> <li>5. Site promoter and responder Edenstone, support the allocation of the site. See additional supporting documents for the Monmouthshire RLDP Preferred Strategy Representations on behalf of Edenstone.</li> </ol>	5. Edenstone
<b>Candidate Site: CS0278 Land West of Raglan</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – The HER notes the site of a potential Medieval land management adjacent; artefacts of prehistoric date recorded within the site. An archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concerns re the scale of the site in relation to the rest of the community and its needs.</li> <li>3. The development of a site of this scale would heavily reduce the amount of high-quality agricultural land.</li> <li>4. Concerns re unsustainable transport and commuting caused by proposed development contrary to Planning Policy Wales. Site will generate an unacceptable level of traffic.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the impact that the proposed development will have on the setting and landscape of the village from viewpoints across the area.</li> <li>6. Responder objects to this site as they believe that the needs of the present are met but at the cost of compromising the ability for future generations to meet their own needs.</li> <li>7. Responder believes existing commercial estate should be expanded instead of allocating a new site.</li> <li>8. Responder believes this site to be the best out of those proposed due to its good road access and believes that the development would bring lots of advantages.</li> <li>9. Concerns regarding the incomplete residential site for 45 dwellings within the village envelope and will object of site CS0278 until the council demonstrates its ability to turn planning into reality.</li> <li>10. Responders believe the site is deliverable, viable and developable and meets the requirements of the preferred strategy.</li> <li>11. The site has good access and could be developed without significantly effecting the existing village. The site also provides a range of employment opportunities; therefore, the responders support the development of the site and ask that the council contact them if they require further information pertaining to the site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Raglan Community Council</li> <li>3. Raglan Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. Raglan Community Council</li> <li>5. Raglan Community Council</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0281 Raglan Country Estate</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – The HER notes the area as a part of a Medieval deer park, some changes due to the landscaping for the golf club, areas of land remain as fields; artefacts of prehistoric date recorded within the site. An archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concerns re scale of the development and effect this would have on the landscape from vantage points around the community.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Raglan Community Council</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Concerns that developments would cause an increase in traffic generation.</li> <li>4. The responder objects to the development of the site as they believe it focuses on short terms needs and doesn't consider the long-term implications it could have on future residents.</li> <li>5. Responder would object to this site if CS0278 was approved as they believe it is a better site from an access point of view and would also object if there was no strategic traffic planning in place for the development.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Raglan Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. Raglan Community Council</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Usk</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0039 Little Castle Farm, Monmouth Road, Usk</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. Farm buildings extant on 1831 First Series mapping, desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Responders state that along with the other two sites (CS0113 and CS0282) would amount to an unacceptable scale of expansion of Usk and would be contrary to MCC policy of just a small amount of new housing in secondary settlements.</li> <li>3. Concerns re a surface water problem and the phosphate issues which continue to pollute the river. The River Usk is a SSSI/SAC and is heavily polluted with the highest phosphate levels of any river in Wales.</li> <li>4. Concerns that development will increase the risk of flooding due to the lack of natural moisture absorption through fields, hedgerows and trees.</li> <li>5. Concerns that Usk's sewerage system is antiquated and unable to cope with current demand. Sewage matter is released through the Mill St Combined Storm Overflow.</li> <li>6. The A472 passing through Usk is one of only 2 areas in Monmouthshire that is subject to Air Quality Monitoring. This is exacerbated by inadequate parking leading to on street parking which causes congestion. Any development would likely lead to further commuting and general travel with worsening air quality.</li> <li>7. Concerns for Usk bridge which cannot withstand more big lorries which would be needed for construction along with the increase in traffic that development would bring.</li> <li>8. Responders state there is no road access to this field and any new access onto Monmouth Road would require up-grading of that stretch of road.</li> <li>9. Concerns that the town does not have the infrastructure of doctors/dentists/local transport/school/leisure facilities to handle any further demand.</li> <li>10. Responders state there is a limited bus service, sporadic evening taxi service and no railway station resulting in a high dependence on car use and no investment to develop cycleways to relieve local traffic.</li> <li>11. Responders state that the site falls outside the desirable 20 minute walk from the centre of Usk town and, with it's significant gradient, would not be a sustainable site nor promote active travel.</li> <li>12. Concerns re the limited amount of employment within Usk with no realistic expectation developing sufficient jobs to employ new residents.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Usk Civic Society plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Usk Town Council plus 13 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Usk Town Council plus 17 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Usk Town Council plus 13 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Usk Town Council plus 12 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. Usk Town Council plus 12 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. Usk Town Council, Usk Civic Society plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. Usk Civic Society plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>13. Usk Town Council plus 10 Private Individuals</li> <li>14. Usk Town Council, Usk Civic Society plus 10 Private Individuals</li> <li>15. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>16. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>17. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>18. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>19. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<p>13. Responders feel there is a lack of study in the area of Environment/Animals/Landscape with reference to the impact any development would have on protected animal and bird species. Usk has an iconic landscape with importance for wildlife sustainability, existing habitat and habitat connectivity for protected species such as bats and newts.</p> <p>14. Responders state that any development above the current contour of the Usk settlement would have a detrimental effect on the existing landscape. Expansive views from the nearby popular tourist footpath would be ruined.</p> <p>15. Responders state that the land proposed is greenfield, grade 3 agricultural land currently used for crops and grazing.</p> <p>16. Concerns re the loss of open green space, within walking distance, for health and wellbeing.</p> <p>17. Concerns that development would affect the privacy of existing homes.</p> <p>18. A responder states that Usk is a historic town and the site is the location of the battle of Pwll Melyn and as such should be preserved.</p> <p>19. Notices at the candidate sites would have ensured a more representative consultation.</p>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0105 Land at Former Goods Yard, Usk</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. 19<sup>th</sup> century goods yard to the Monmouth to Pontypool railway, extant contemporary buildings, also Second World War defences in the immediate area. Development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>2. A responder states that Flood modelling by JBA Consulting concludes that the site is at flood risk in extreme events. It is proposed that the development site is raised above the flood level to comply with TAN15. Compensatory flood storage should be implemented alongside the ground raising. The responder states that their clients control land outside of the site which could provide storage for the development of the site but could also contribute towards the wider flood defences for Usk.</li> <li>3. Usk Civic Society objects to the site due to it being in the 1 in 100 year flood event zone making it unsuitable for vulnerable housing development. Furthermore the A472 (the means of exit from the site) floods in sub 1 in 100 events (eg Storm Dennis). Other responders have concerns re the increased potential of water run-off which is already a problem on Monmouth Road.</li> <li>4. Support for development of the site as it is brownfield and it's size is in proportion to the targets identified in the RLDP Preferred Strategy. The site is close to town centre enabling residents to walk and not increase traffic and development would have a positive impact on the visual appeal of the area.</li> <li>5. Respondents state that Usk and nearby settlements have very limited employment opportunities requiring residents to travel for work and as public transport is limited, to an infrequent bus service, these journeys have to be made by car.</li> <li>6. Concerns re increased pollution, as air quality levels in the town are currently below the required standards and an increase in traffic will exacerbate this, along with extra congestion, parking problems and a greater risk of accidents at current black spots.</li> <li>7. Concerns re local amenities. There is no spare capacity in services such as GPs and dentists, and, no local bank or police station.</li> <li>8. Concerns regarding the ageing sewage system, lack of investment by Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water and pollution of the river Usk from sewage outfall. Respondents have further concerns of pollution to the River Usk, from increased urban run off from development of the site and the risk of increased phosphorus loading.</li> <li>9. Concerns that development will have a detrimental impact on the habitats of local wildlife; evidence of protected species at the candidate site.</li> <li>10. A responder feels that notices at the candidate sites would have ensured a more representative consultation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Usk Civic Society plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. 4 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

<b>Candidate Site: CS0113 Burrium Gate (Phase II), Usk</b>	<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. Farm buildings extant on 1831 First Series mapping, desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Responders state that along with the other two sites (CS0113 and CS0282) would amount to an unacceptable scale of expansion of Usk and would be contrary to MCC policy of just a small amount of new housing in secondary settlements.</li> <li>3. Concerns re a surface water problem and the phosphate issues which continue to pollute the river. The River Usk is a SSSI/SAC and is heavily polluted with the highest phosphate levels of any river in Wales.</li> <li>4. Concerns that development will increase the risk of flooding due to the lack of natural moisture absorption through fields, hedgerows and trees.</li> <li>5. Concerns that Usk's sewerage system is antiquated and unable to cope with current demand. Sewage matter is released through the Mill St Combined Storm Overflow.</li> <li>6. The A472 passing through Usk is one of only 2 areas in Monmouthshire that is subject to Air Quality Monitoring. This is exacerbated by inadequate parking leading to on street parking which causes congestion. Any development would likely lead to further commuting and general travel with worsening air quality.</li> <li>7. Concerns regarding the hazard of double parking and parking on pavements at the existing dwellings in the vicinity of this site.</li> <li>8. Concerns for Usk bridge which cannot withstand more big lorries which would be needed for construction along with the increase in traffic that development would bring.</li> <li>9. Responders state there is no road access to this field and any new access onto Monmouth Road would require up-grading of that stretch of road.</li> <li>10. Concerns that the town does not have the infrastructure of doctors/dentists/local transport/schools/leisure facilities to handle any further demand. A responder comments on the closure and cutting back of many services including the closure of the local police station and of the waste recycling facility.</li> <li>11. Responders state there is a limited bus service, sporadic evening taxi service and no railway station resulting in a high dependence on car use and no investment to develop cycleways to relieve local traffic.</li> <li>12. Responders state that the site falls outside the desirable 20 minute walk from the centre of Usk town and, with it's significant gradient, would not be a sustainable site nor promote active travel.</li> <li>13. Concerns re the limited amount of employment within Usk with no realistic expectation of developing sufficient jobs to employ new residents; increasing the need for commuting.</li> <li>14. Responders feel there is a lack of study in the area of Environment/Animals/Landscape with reference to the impact any development would have on protected animal and bird species. Usk has an iconic landscape with importance for wildlife sustainability, existing habitat and habitat connectivity for protected species such as bats and newts.</li> <li>15. Responders state that any development above the current contour of the Usk settlement would have a detrimental effect on the existing landscape. Expansive views from the nearby popular tourist footpath would be ruined.</li> <li>16. Responders state that the land proposed is greenfield, grade 3 agricultural land currently used for crops and grazing.</li> <li>17. Concerns re the loss of open green space, within walking distance, for health and wellbeing.</li> </ol>

	<p>18. Responders state that Usk is a historic town and the proposed site is the location of the battle of Pwll Melyn, and as such, should be preserved. Development would have a detrimental impact on the features and areas of tourism interest and on the beautiful and peaceful landscape.</p> <p>19. Notices at the candidate sites would have ensured a more representative consultation.</p>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0282 North Burrium Gate, Usk</b>		<b>Repsentor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. Farm buildings extant on 1831 First Series mapping, desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. The site sponsor, Johnsey Estates 2020 Ltd, supports the site and makes the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By virtue of its location relatively close to Monmouth and the key services and facilities available in Monmouth and in Usk itself, Usk has the potential to accommodate a level of growth.</li> <li>• Usk experiences higher levels of self-containment and provides significant potential for minimising the need to travel and for sustainable travel.</li> <li>• Initial site and other assessments have confirmed that there are no fundamental constraints to the site coming forward for development.</li> <li>• It is anticipated that the site could provide up to 95 units which would increase the critical mass of the settlement and help to sustain vital local services and facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Responders state that along with the other two sites (CS0113 and CS0282) would amount to an unacceptable scale of expansion of Usk and would be contrary to MCC policy of just a small amount of new housing in secondary settlements.</li> <li>4. Concerns re a surface water problem and the phosphate issues which continue to pollute the river. The River Usk is a SSSI/SAC and is heavily polluted with the highest phosphate levels of any river in Wales.</li> <li>5. Concerns that development will increase the risk of flooding due to the lack of natural moisture absorption through fields, hedgerows and trees.</li> <li>6. Concerns that Usk's sewerage system is antiquated and unable to cope with current demand. Sewage matter is released through the Mill St Combined Storm Overflow.</li> <li>7. The A472 passing through Usk is one of only 2 areas in Monmouthshire that is subject to Air Quality Monitoring. This is exacerbated by inadequate parking leading to on street parking which causes congestion. Any development would likely lead to further commuting and general travel with worsening air quality.</li> <li>8. Concerns for Usk bridge which cannot withstand more big lorries which would be needed for construction along with the increase in traffic that development would bring.</li> <li>9. Responders state there is no road access to this field and any new access onto Monmouth Road would require up-grading of that stretch of road.</li> <li>10. Concerns that the town does not have the infrastructure of doctors/dentists/local transport/school/leisure facilities to handle any further demand. There is no local recycling centre, supermarket nor police presence.</li> <li>11. Responders state there is a limited bus service, sporadic evening taxi service and no railway station resulting in a high dependence on car use and no investment to develop cycleways to relieve local traffic.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Johnsey Estates 2020 Ltd</li> <li>3. Usk Civic Society plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Usk Town Council plus 13 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Usk Town Council plus 17 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Usk Town Council plus 14 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Usk Town Council plus 14 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. Usk Town Council plus 13 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. Usk Town Council, Usk Civic Society plus 9 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. Usk Civic Society plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>13. 10 Private Individuals</li> <li>14. Usk Town Council plus 10 Private Individuals</li> <li>15. Usk Town Council, Usk Civic Society plus 9 Private Individuals</li> <li>16. 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>17. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>18. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>19. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>



	<p>12. Responders state that the site falls outside the desirable 20 minute walk from the centre of Usk town and, with its significant gradient, would not be a sustainable site nor promote active travel.</p> <p>13. Concerns re the limited amount of employment within Usk with no realistic expectation developing sufficient jobs to employ new residents.</p> <p>14. Responders feel there is a lack of study in the area of Environment/Animals/Landscape with reference to the impact any development would have on protected animal and bird species. Usk has an iconic landscape with importance for wildlife sustainability, existing habitat and habitat connectivity for protected species such as bats and newts.</p> <p>15. Responders state that any development above the current contour of the Usk settlement would have a detrimental effect on the existing landscape. Expansive views from the nearby popular tourist footpath would be ruined.</p> <p>16. Responders state that the land proposed is greenfield, grade 3 agricultural land currently used for crops and grazing.</p> <p>17. Concerns re the loss of open green space, within walking distance, for health and wellbeing.</p> <p>18. Responders state that Usk is a historic town and the proposed site is the location of the battle of Pwll Melyn, and as such, should be preserved. Development would have a detrimental impact on the features and areas of tourism interest and on the beautiful and peaceful landscape.</p> <p>19. Notices at the candidate sites would have ensured a more representative consultation.</p>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0285 Glen Yr Afon, Usk</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<p>1. A responder raises the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Massive population increase with limited employment opportunities in Usk.</li> <li>• Increased pollution, congestion and parking problems.</li> <li>• Services including GP and dentist already under strain and no local bank or police station.</li> <li>• Ageing sewage system already overwhelmed.</li> <li>• Increased risk of flooding due to loss of land absorbency.</li> <li>• Further encroachment on the habitat of delicate ecosystems.</li> </ul>	1. 1 Private Individual

## Main Rural Settlements

Devauden		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0036 North Devauden</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</p> <p>2. The site promotor, Leathdunn Ltd, has submitted supporting information for the site and makes the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not constrained by topography, ecology, heritage or landscape features and its proximity and connection to Devauden make it a logical extension of the settlement.</li> </ul>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</p> <p>2. Leathdunn Ltd</p> <p>3. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>4. 2 Private Individual</p> <p>5. 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>6. 2 Private Individual</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Flood Consequence Assessment would need to be carried out for the site to confirm its suitability for development and confirm that an FCA would be carried out and submitted with any planning application for the site should it be allocated within the RLDP.</li> <li>• The site would not contribute to coalescence of Devauden with any other settlement and would not represent encroachment into the countryside due to the presence of existing properties to the north.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Responders state that the site was previously rejected as a candidate site due to it's High Biodiversity Value and has subsequently been designated as a SINC.</li> <li>4. The site has species-rich hedgerows and is considered to have high connectivity value to both the adjacent habitat and the wider landscape of the neighbouring SINC sites.</li> <li>5. Concerns that the site is highly visible within the Wye Valley AONB; development of a site with evidenced high biodiversity value and within an AONB would directly contravene The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015.</li> <li>6. Concerns that the sewage treatment plant in Devauden is at capacity; there have been sewage overflow issues already.</li> <li>7. Concerns regarding surface water run off on the property directly below the site.</li> </ol>	7. 1 Private Individual
<b>Candidate Site: CS0214 Land at Churchfields, Devauden</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>2. The site promotor, Monmouthshire Housing Association, makes the following supporting comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development opportunity is considered to represent proportionate growth in line with the Council's {referred Strategy.</li> <li>• The site will provide much needed affordable homes.</li> <li>• The development will help support and benefit from existing services within the settlement.</li> <li>• Devauden is served by a bus route between the key towns of Monmouth and Chepstow.</li> <li>• Landscape Appraisal confirmed that there's no reason why the site could not be developed in landscape and visual terms with regard to the AONB.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Monmouthshire Housing Association</li> </ol>
<b>Little Mill</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0016 Land to the east of Little Mill</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>2. On the basis of the technical, work set out at the Candidate Sites stage in August 2021, the site sponsor believes this site is technically deliverable, viable and developable and meets the requirements of the Preferred Strategy. The site has sound access off the public and highway and good transport links. The responder believes the site is a logical extension to the wider village and could be developed without significantly affecting the setting of the existing village. The proposal for the site includes a small commercial hub to support local businesses and startups.</li> <li>3. A responder states that this rural employment site is on greenfield land and would not be in sufficiently close proximity to Usk to serve as a local employment opportunity for this Tier 2 Secondary Settlement.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. BB3 Limited</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. SEWRIGS group</li> </ol>

	4. SEWRIGS group state that the site lies within the Usk Terminal Moraine Regionally Important Geodiversity Site (RIGS): Important site showing the maximum extent of the Late Devensian glaciation in SE Wales. The study of the last ice age is part of Climate Science. This site was the limit of glaciation during the last ice age. It is important that no action is taken which would jeopardise further research. As stated in Planning Policy Wales, Planning Authorities should protect the features and qualities for which RIGS have been designated. The impact of proposed developments will depend on the nature of the RIGS feature, so early consultation with the local RIGS group or NRW is strongly recommended.	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0075 Little Mill (Site B)</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd
<b>Candidate Site: CS0103 Adj Berthon Road, Little Mill</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues. Mill race shown on historic mapping forms the southern boundary.</li> <li>2. Monmouthshire Housing Association have submitted separate supporting information but note that an FCA has been prepared which concludes that the site is in Flood Zone A which is considered to be at little or no risk of flooding and that proposed development would not increase flooding elsewhere.</li> <li>3. Concerns re volume of traffic exacerbating a dangerous junction from a private driveway, a potentially dangerous junction into the site and over height HGVs unable to pass under the railway bridge.</li> <li>4. Concerns re flooding as the lower area of the site is often waterlogged and during periods of heavy rain is flooded. The site currently acts as a sponge so should it be built on there are concerns as to the effect on water levels further down into the village.</li> <li>5. Environmental issues including concern for the three large oaks on site which provide habitat for a number of bird species, the meadow itself is a hunting ground for owls and the hedgerows provide habitat for hedgehogs and slow worms.</li> <li>6. A responder states that the village has a lack of amenities, no school and a limited bus service. Pavements under the narrow railway bridge are inadequate and there is no safe crossing for the dual carriageway.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Monmouthshire Housing Association</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0104 Cae Melin, Little Mill</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues. Trackway shown on historic mapping to the east.</li> <li>2. The site sponsor, Persimmon Homes East Wales, makes the following key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within a short walk of local amenities and services including a bus stop which provides access to the 61 &amp; 63 services.</li> <li>• Further services, amenities and employment at nearby towns and cities are easily accessible via the A4042.</li> <li>• The site is not located within the Upper River Wye Catchment Area and is not impacted by the implications of the TAN15 flood map.</li> <li>• There are no designations that cannot be carefully mitigated and accommodated for.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Persimmon Homes East Wales</li> <li>3. SEWRIGS group</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. SEWRIGS group state that the site falls within the Usk Glacier Terminal Morain RIGS. As per PPW, Planning Authorities should protect the features and qualities for which RIGS have been designated. The impact of proposed developments will depend on the nature of the RIGS feature so early consultation with the local RIGS group or NRW is strongly recommended.</li> <li>4. Concerns re flooding to adjacent property caused by run off from this site; development of the site would exacerbate this.</li> <li>5. A responder states that the site is currently used for agricultural purposes: graving for livestock as well as providing hay/silage.</li> <li>6. Concerns re increased pressure on sewerage system</li> <li>7. Concerns re overloading of local infrastructure such as doctors surgery and the school at Penperlleni.</li> <li>8. Concerns re increased traffic on the roads and reduced air quality.</li> </ol>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0233 Mulberry House, Berthon Road, Little Mill</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>2. SEWRIGS group state that the site falls within the Usk Glacier Terminal Morain RIGS. As per PPW, Planning Authorities should protect the features and qualities for which RIGS have been designated. The impact of proposed developments will depend on the nature of the RIGS feature so early consultation with the local RIGS group or NRW is strongly recommended.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. SEWRIGS group</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0241 Land to North of Little Mill (Site A)</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> </ol>
<b>Llanbadoc</b>		
<b>SITE FILTERED OUT - Candidate Site: CS0238 Land at Prioress Mill Lane, Llanbadoc</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A responder makes the following points in support of the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monmouthshire has a net-outflow of commuters; support for inward investment and local employment growth/opportunities is needed.</li> <li>• This site would facilitate the provision of a range of types and sizes of employment uses in a broadly sustainable location where it could serve nearby communities, including the settlement of Usk, and complement nearby uses, on previously developed commercial land. It is therefore firmly contended that the site is in accordance with the Preferred Strategy.</li> <li>• No other Candidate Sites were promoted in or around the settlement of Usk for employment use. Only two Candidate Sites, which included employment use in rural areas, have been progressed; both of these rural employment sites are on greenfield land and neither would be in sufficiently close proximity to Usk to serve as a local employment opportunity for this Tier 2 Secondary Settlement which has been identified for growth.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

## Llandogo

Candidate Site: CS0101 Land adjacent to Parklands, Llandogo		Representor:
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – Concerns about the impact of the site on the Lower Wye Valley Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historical interest, and HLCA024 Llandogo and the need for an ASIDOHL. No recorded or known archaeological features in the site.</li> <li>2. The responder is concerned that the current village infrastructure is not able to sustain the new development.</li> <li>3. Concerns re an increase in commuters, and that access and commuting roads used will not be suitable for an influx in usage. Roads have been subject to landslips and falling trees, deep surface water after heavy rain and surface degradation, making them not fit for current usage.</li> <li>4. Concerns re previous major water outages and the measures the wastewater treatment works will take to cope with the new developments.</li> <li>5. Bus service does not operate in times needed for an increase in usage by working people.</li> <li>6. Concerns re the use of greenfield sites for new housing and how the infrastructure needed for new developments will degrade the wildlife and biodiversity of the village, negatively impacting Wye Valley as an AONB.</li> <li>7. Concerns re flooding and what defences will need to be implemented as the site is subject to TAN 15 and water covers the lower parts of the fields when the Wye breaches.</li> <li>8. Concern re vacant properties around the site many of which are used for Holiday Letting and Airbnb, reducing the amount of long-term rental properties.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeologic Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
Candidate Site: CS0124 The Reckless, Llandogo		Representor:
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – Concerns about the impact of the site on the Lower Wye Valley Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historical interest, and HLCA024 Llandogo and the need for an ASIDOHL. No recorded or known archaeological features in the site.</li> <li>2. The responder is concerned that the current village infrastructure is not able to sustain the new development.</li> <li>3. Concerns re an increase in commuters, and that access and commuting roads used will not be suitable for an influx in usage. Roads have been subject to landslips and falling trees, deep surface water after heavy rain and surface degradation, making them not fit for current usage.</li> <li>4. Concerns re previous major water outages and the measures the wastewater treatment works will take to cope with the new developments.</li> <li>5. Bus service does not operate in times needed for an increase in usage by working people.</li> <li>6. Concerns re the use of greenfield sites for new housing and how the infrastructure needed for new developments will degrade the wildlife and biodiversity of the village, negatively impacting Wye Valley as an AONB.</li> <li>7. Concerns re flooding and what defences will need to be implemented as the site is subject to TAN 15 and water covers the lower parts of the fields when the Wye breaches.</li> <li>8. Concern re vacant properties around the site many of which are used for Holiday Letting and Airbnb, reducing the amount of long-term rental properties.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeologic Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

<b>Candidate Site: CS0230 Land South of A466, Llandogo</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – Concerns about the impact of the site on the Lower Wye Valley Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historical interest, and HLCA017 Wye Valley Railway South and the need for an ASIDOHL. No recorded or known archaeological features in the site. Wye Valley Railway forms the southern boundary.</li> <li>2. The responder is concerned that the current village infrastructure is not able to sustain the new development.</li> <li>3. Concerns re an increase in commuters, and that access and commuting roads used will not be suitable for an influx in usage. Roads have been subject to landslips and falling trees, deep surface water after heavy rain and surface degradation, making them not fit for current usage.</li> <li>4. Concerns re previous major water outages and the measures the wastewater treatment works will take to cope with the new developments.</li> <li>5. Bus service does not operate in times needed for an increase in usage by working people.</li> <li>6. Concerns re the use of greenfield sites for new housing and how the infrastructure needed for new developments will degrade the wildlife and biodiversity of the village, negatively impacting Wye Valley as an AONB.</li> <li>7. Concerns re flooding and what defences will need to be implemented as the site is subject to TAN 15 and water covers the lower parts of the fields when the Wye breaches.</li> <li>8. Concern re vacant properties around the site many of which are used for Holiday Letting and Airbnb, reducing the amount of long-term rental properties.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeologic Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0245 Land at Parklands, Llandogo</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – Concerns about the impact of the site on the Lower Wye Valley Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historical interest, and HLCA024 Llandogo and the need for an ASIDOHL. No recorded or known archaeological features in the site.</li> <li>2. The responder is concerned that the current village infrastructure is not able to sustain the new development.</li> <li>3. Concerns re an increase in commuters, and that access and commuting roads used will not be suitable for an influx in usage. Roads have been subject to landslips and falling trees, deep surface water after heavy rain and surface degradation, making them not fit for current usage.</li> <li>4. Concerns re previous major water outages and the measures the wastewater treatment works will take to cope with the new developments.</li> <li>5. Bus service does not operate in times needed for an increase in usage by working people.</li> <li>6. Concerns re the use of greenfield sites for new housing and how the infrastructure needed for new developments will degrade the wildlife and biodiversity of the village, negatively impacting Wye Valley as an AONB.</li> <li>7. Concerns re flooding and what defences will need to be implemented as the site is subject to TAN 15 and water covers the lower parts of the fields when the Wye breaches.</li> <li>8. Concern re vacant properties around the site many of which are used for Holiday Letting and Airbnb, reducing the amount of long-term rental properties.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeologic Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

Llanellen		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0027 Adj Llanellen Court (North)</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – The HER notes the findspot of a 1<sup>st</sup> century Roman brooch; not noted if an isolated find or related to other evidence of activity. Desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0215 Land at Llanellen</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – The HER notes the findspot of a 1<sup>st</sup> century Roman brooch; not noted if an isolated find or related to other evidence of activity. Desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>The site promotor has submitted Preferred Strategy representation forms and supporting information and makes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is located in Flood Zone A and is considered to be at very low risk of fluvial/tidal flooding.</li> <li>The site is well located within reasonable walking distance of local bus services and village hall.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>Monmouthshire Housing Association</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0243 North of Village Hall, Llangybi</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>The site promotor, Llanover Estates, has submitted extensive information in support of the site and makes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial site and other assessments have shown that there are no fundamental constraints to the site coming forward for development.</li> <li>The site itself is not subject to any statutory designations and is located close to employment opportunities, schools, healthcare and the range of facilities and services offered by Abergavenny Town Centre.</li> <li>The site has the capacity to accommodate a wetland area which will not only act to separate the built development from the River Usk, but will also offer the opportunity to incorporate reed beds for the purpose of phosphate stripping.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A responder feels that the B4269 which links the site to the A4042 suffers from substandard junction arrangement with the A4042 in terms of geometry and visibility.</li> <li>The responder states that the site has a high Landmap value for LLCA in terms of visual and sensory, historic and cultural landscapes.</li> <li>The site lies within Flood zone 2/3 and is at risk of flooding by the River Usk.</li> <li>The sites northern boundary is in direct proximity to the River Usk corridor which forms part of an ecological designation within the current LDP (SSSi &amp; SAC) which indicates that the site has high ecological significance.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>Llanover Estates</li> <li>1 Private Individual</li> <li>1 Private Individual</li> <li>1 Private Individual</li> <li>1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

Llangwm		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0283 Rockfield Farm, Llangwm</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – The HER notes the Scheduled Monument of Ringwork NE of New House MM074 borders the site. Desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> </ol>
Llangybi		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0019 St Cybi Drive, Llangybi</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>2. Concerns re the 50yr old sewage system, and its ability to cope with current sewage levels at the Treatment Plant. Frequent blockages and overflows have caused effluent to flow out onto Ynys Lane, which has had an impact on pedestrians most notably dog walkers. An increased number of residents, is believed, will exacerbate the issues, and disturb existing systems.</li> <li>3. Concerns re waterlogging and natural springs which feed down into the lower reaches of the village. Surface water is already streaming through properties nearby the sites due to insufficient infrastructure. The reduction of permeable land due to development will create a serious risk of flood.</li> <li>4. Concerns re an increased number of vehicles and therefore traffic due to new developments, where existing infrastructure inadequately deals with current demands because of narrow roads and lack of pavements. Parking for vehicles has become a problem, especially near existing MHA dwellings.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the lack and loss of local amenities such as the school, shop, post office services, sports facilities, and garage. This has contributed to scepticism surrounding the areas categorisation as a main village in the RLDP proposals.</li> <li>6. Concerns re developments preventing the continued use of the site as agricultural land for sheep to graze upon and its importance in the lambing process.</li> <li>7. Concerns regarding the existing limited bus service.</li> <li>8. Concerns re distance of the site from main road systems.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust</li> <li>2. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Llangybi Fawr Community Council 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 2 Private Individuals</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0020 West The Chase, Llangybi</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green - No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>2. Concerns re the 50yr old sewage system, and its ability to cope with current sewage levels at the Treatment Plant. Frequent blockages and overflows have caused effluent to flow out onto Ynys Lane, which has had an impact on pedestrians most notably dog walkers. An increased number of residents, is believed, will exacerbate the issues, and disturb existing systems.</li> <li>3. Concerns re waterlogging and natural springs which feed down into the lower reaches of the village. Surface water is already streaming through properties nearby the sites due to insufficient infrastructure. The reduction of permeable land due to development will create a serious risk of flood.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust</li> <li>2. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 2 Private Individuals</li> </ol>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Concerns re an increased number of vehicles and therefore traffic due to new developments, where existing infrastructure inadequately deals with current demands because of narrow roads and lack of pavements. Parking for vehicles has become a problem, especially near existing MHA dwellings.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the lack and loss of local amenities such as the school, shop, post office services, sports facilities, and garage. This has contributed to scepticism surrounding the areas categorisation as a main village in the RLDP proposals.</li> <li>6. Concerns re developments preventing the continued use of the site as agricultural land for sheep to graze upon and its importance in the lambing process.</li> <li>7. Concerns regarding the existing limited bus service.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 2 Private Individuals</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0242 Land North of New House, Llangybi</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust assess the site as Red – Included orchards shown on Tithe, borders managed features of withy beds and ponds, associated with New House Farm just outside boundary to the south. HER details extensive prehistoric artefacts and cropmarks, and enclosure of potential Iron Age/ Roman date in the field and surrounding fields. Desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concerns re the 50yr old sewage system, and its ability to cope with current sewage levels at the Treatment Plant. Frequent blockages and overflows have caused effluent to flow out onto Ynys Lane, which has had an impact on pedestrians most notably dog walkers. An increased number of residents, is believed, will exacerbate the issues, and disturb existing systems.</li> <li>3. Concerns re waterlogging and natural springs which feed down into the lower reaches of the village. Surface water is already streaming through properties nearby the sites due to insufficient infrastructure. The reduction of permeable land due to development will create a serious risk of flood.</li> <li>4. Concerns re an increased number of vehicles and therefore traffic due to new developments, where existing infrastructure inadequately deals with current demands because of narrow roads and lack of pavements. Parking for vehicles has become a problem, especially near existing MHA dwellings.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the lack and loss of local amenities such as the school, shop, post office services, sports facilities, and garage. This has contributed to scepticism surrounding the areas categorisation as a main village in the RLDP proposals.</li> <li>6. Concerns re developments preventing the continued use of the site as agricultural land for sheep to graze upon and its importance in the lambing process.</li> <li>7. Concerns regarding the existing limited bus service.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust</li> <li>2. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. Llangybi Fawr Community Council</li> <li>4. Llangybi Fawr Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. Llangybi Fawr Community Council</li> <li>6. Llangybi Fawr Community Council</li> <li>7. Llangybi Fawr Community Council</li> </ol>
<b>Llanishen</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0221 Land at Penarth Farm, Llanishen</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green – No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> </ol>

<b>Issues Raised:</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0222 Land at Penarth Farm, Llanishen</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – HER notes potential mill site. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determined work.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd
<b>Llanover</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0139 Land at Former Petrol Station, Llanover</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – Eastern boundary adjacent to the road bordering the Registered Park and Garden of Llanover Park PGW(Gt)41(MON) Cadw must be consulted and a Heritage Impact Assessment undertaken to ascertain the impact of the proposal on the setting of the Park.</li> <li>2. The site promotor, Llanover Estates, has submitted extensive information in support of the site and makes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial site and other assessments have shown that there are no fundamental constraints to the site coming forward for development.</li> <li>• The site forms a logical extension to the existing Llanover Business Centre which contributes a strong existing employment function to the settlement, providing employment opportunities both for the settlement and more widely to the nearby rural villages.</li> <li>• Llanover has relatively good connection to nearby settlements by a range of public transport and active travel opportunities and is therefore an appropriate location for employment growth.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. A responder states that this rural employment site is on greenfield land and would not be in sufficiently close proximity to Usk to serve as a local employment opportunity for it as a Tier 2 Secondary Settlement, which has been identified for growth.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Llanover Estates</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0140 South of Rhyd-y-Meirch, Llanover</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Green. No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues.</li> <li>2. The site promotor, Llanover Estates, has submitted extensive information in support of the site and makes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Llanover has the potential to accommodate a level of growth as recognised through its inclusion in the Preferred Strategy as a Main Rural Settlement.</li> <li>• Initial site and other assessments have shown that there are no fundamental constraints to the site coming forward for development.</li> <li>• The site itself is not subject to any statutory designations and is located close to employment opportunities, schools, healthcare and the range of facilities and services offered by Abergavenny Town Centre.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Llanover Estates</li> </ol>

## Mathern

Candidate Site: CS0026 West Baileys Hay, Mathern		Representor:
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – No recorded or known archaeological or historic environment issues. Mill race noted on historic mapping, outside the boundary to the west.</li> <li>2. Concerns re lack of infrastructure and amenities and plans for new infrastructure and amenities to support current residents, such as broadband services, playparks, and education centres. An increase in residents due to the developments will only worsen the issue.</li> <li>3. Concerns re inadequate Public Transport facilities and active travel measures to provide access to local areas and for commuting purposes, only increasing car usage.</li> <li>4. New residents are likely to work away from home increasing number of commuters. Roads are inadequate for current levels of traffic and congestion and development would exacerbate this. Current congestion on the A48 increases the number of cars using small local lanes which are not able to deal with the demand. Increased car usage leads to increased pollution. Concerns re safety of those accessing area via active travel.</li> <li>5. Concerns re impact on aesthetics. Development needs to be sensitive of the village's local character.</li> <li>6. Concerns re health services ability to cope demand and an increased number of residents due to development will increase issues.</li> <li>7. Concerns re sewerage and water drainage facilities as effluent has previously spilled out onto the street and the use of WCs in local dwellings have been affected. Water pressure and electricity supply may also be affected by the developments.</li> <li>8. Site is agriculturally productive.</li> <li>9. Concerns re development of the area as it is not marked as a national growth area identified in Future Wales 2040.</li> <li>10. Concerns re sites partial inclusion in Main Village Boundary and therefore should not be taken forward into the replacement LDP.</li> <li>11. Concerns re the introduction of a younger demographic and its effects on pace of life. New residents negatively impact areas by using development as strategic residence for commuting and not contributing to existing village culture.</li> <li>12. New developments are not affordable. Concerns over the viability of 50% affordable housing and concerns over low standards for net zero homes.</li> <li>13. Lack of or no consultation with residents affected by the site. Residents not included in the correct area zones for consultation</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown</li> <li>6. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>9. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. Cllr Louise Brown</li> <li>11. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
Candidate Site: CS0053 East of Cherry Trees, Mathern		Representor:
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – Adjoins the Registered Park of WyelandsPGW(Gt)51(MON), and part of the Essential Setting is within the south-eastern part of the site. Assessment of the impact will need to be undertaken to Cadw Guidance.</li> <li>2. Drainage issues including concerns re the open water source flowing through the site which has made the site prone to flooding, development could enhance this.</li> <li>3. Concerns re access to the site and the impact of increased use by cars on non-vehicle users.</li> <li>4. Concerns over lack of infrastructure for existing residents, such as NHS availability and public transport.</li> <li>5. An increased number of residents in the area will result in more traffic and subsequent congestion.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeologic Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. Cllr Louise Brown plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. Mathern Community Council</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Concerns re unmanaged conservation area.</li> <li>7. Responder expresses overall support.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>6. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>7. Mathern Community Council</li> </ol>
<b>Portskewett</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0066 Bridge View Farm, Portskewett</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concern that local services are unable to cope with expansion. Primary schools and secondary schools are at full capacity as are the doctors and dentists.</li> <li>3. Traffic congestion is a concern as any incidents on the M4 or either of the bridges causes chaos in both directions.</li> <li>4. A responder states that a lack of local employment and public transport options means greater pollution due to reliance on the car.</li> <li>5. A responder feels that a lack of green open space and countryside is having an affect on nature, flooding and the general health of those who live here.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0259 Bridge View Farm, Portskewett</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. A desk based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concern that local services are unable to cope with expansion. Primary schools and secondary schools are at full capacity as are the doctors and dentists.</li> <li>3. Traffic congestion is a concern as any incidents on the M4 or either of the bridges causes chaos in both directions.</li> <li>4. A responder states that a lack of local employment and public transport options means greater pollution due to reliance on the car.</li> <li>5. A responder feels that a lack of green open space and countryside is having an affect on nature, flooding and the general health of those who live here.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Pwllmeryic</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0030 Land Off Chapel Lane, Pwllmeryic</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – A crop mark is noted in the area, no further information. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concerns re development of the area as it is not marked as a national growth area identified in Future Wales 2040.</li> <li>3. Site is an essential and clearly visible piece of green between Pwllmeryic and Mathern.</li> <li>4. Site is productively in use as valuable agricultural land.</li> <li>5. Roads surrounding the area are already congested and a new development would increase traffic and therefore noise and pollution. Potential to obstruct emergency vehicle accessibility. Access in and out of area will also be affected.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. Mathern Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Concerns re infrastructure such as broadband, education, local amenities, NHS: Doctors and Dentist already under strain from current residents, adding to this will have a detrimental impact.</li> <li>7. Compromise local character, identity, and individuality of the area as two villages will be joined if the site is no longer green belt.</li> <li>8. Concerns re drainage and the previous flooding of the area as well as new developments being able to cope with sewerage demands.</li> <li>9. Concerns re the introduction of a younger demographic and its effects on pace of life. New residents negatively impact areas by using developments as strategic dormitories for commuting to larger cities and towns.</li> <li>10. New developments are not affordable. Concerns over the viability of 50% affordable housing and concerns over low standards for net zero homes.</li> <li>11. Lack of or no consultation with residents affected by the site. Residents not included in the correct area zones for consultation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>8. Cllr Louise Brown plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Shirenewton</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0111 Adjacent to Thistledown Barn, Shirenewton</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – HER details extensive prehistoric artefacts and cropmarks, and enclosure of potential Iron Age / Roman date in the field and surrounding fields. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. In favour of as it is justifiable in relation to flood risk and proposed drainage strategy in line with Statutory SuDS Standards.</li> <li>3. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</li> <li>4. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</li> <li>5. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</li> <li>6. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village.</li> <li>7. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 9 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 9 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> </ol>

	<p>will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</li> <li>9. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</li> <li>10. Responder believes sites in rural areas should be allocated for self-build bungalows for a retiring population, freeing up existing family homes in the area. Responder also believes that a rural village is not the place to build affordable homes for young people and notes that they will be better served by a town with more facilities, access to transport and a wider availability of services.</li> <li>11. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</li> <li>12. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency, noting that it's the opposite of what Future Wales 2040 wants.</li> <li>13. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</li> <li>14. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</li> <li>15. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC's housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</li> <li>16. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. Shirenewton Community Council plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>13. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. Shirenewton Community Council</li> <li>16. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0208 West Shirenewton Recreation Hall, Shirenewton</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – HER details extensive prehistoric artefacts in the field and surrounding fields. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</li> <li>3. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</li> <li>4. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Shirenewton Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</li> <li>7. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</li> <li>8. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</li> <li>9. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</li> <li>10. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency.</li> <li>11. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</li> <li>12. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</li> <li>13. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC's housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</li> <li>14. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Shirenewton Community Council</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0218 Land at Ditch Hill Lane, Shirenewton (Option A)</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – Coxe's Well marked at the eastern periphery, other springs marked on historic mapping; the Well marked as a Brake on the Tithe Map. HER details extensive prehistoric artefacts and cropmarks, and enclosure of potential Iron Age / Roman date in the field and surrounding fields. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</li> <li>3. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</li> <li>4. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 8 Private Individuals</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village.</li> <li>6. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</li> <li>7. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</li> <li>8. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</li> <li>9. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</li> <li>10. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency.</li> <li>11. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</li> <li>12. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</li> <li>13. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC's housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</li> <li>14. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</li> <li>15. Responder concerned that any alteration to the current drainage would adversely affect their property, causing erosion and undermining their boundary wall.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Shirenewton Community Council</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0225 Land at Ditch Hill Lane, Shirenewton (Option B)</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – Coxe's Well marked at the eastern periphery, other springs marked on historic mapping; the Well marked as a Brake on the Tithe Map. HER details extensive prehistoric artefacts and cropmarks, and enclosure of potential Iron Age / Roman date in the field and surrounding fields. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> </ol>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</li> <li>4. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village.</li> <li>6. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</li> <li>7. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</li> <li>8. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</li> <li>9. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</li> <li>10. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency.</li> <li>11. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</li> <li>12. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</li> <li>13. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC's housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</li> <li>14. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</li> <li>15. Responder concerned that any alteration to the current drainage would adversely affect their property, causing erosion and undermining their boundary wall.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Shirenewton Community Council</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0226 Land at Ditch Hill Lane, Shirenewton (Option C)</b>	<b>Representor:</b>	
<b>Summary of Main</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – Coxe's Well marked at the eastern periphery, other springs marked on historical mapping; the Well is marked as a Brake on the Tithe Map. HER details extensive prehistoric artefacts and cropmarks, and enclosure of potential Iron Age / Roman date in the field and surrounding fields. Desk-based assessment and</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> </ol>

<b>Issues Raised:</b>	<p>geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</li> <li>3. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</li> <li>4. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village.</li> <li>6. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</li> <li>7. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</li> <li>8. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</li> <li>9. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</li> <li>10. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency.</li> <li>11. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</li> <li>12. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</li> <li>13. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC's housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</li> <li>14. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</li> <li>15. Responder concerned that any alteration to the current drainage would adversely affect their property, causing erosion and undermining their boundary wall.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 9 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Shirenewton Community Council</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
-----------------------	---	---

Candidate Site: CS0229 Land Opposite Chepstow Garden Centre, Shirenewton	Representor:
<p><b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – A complex of circular enclosures as crop marks tentatively identified as part of a prehistoric burial cairns are within the area. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concerns re drainage of the site as the field regularly floods from the local stream and is potentially in a flood zone area. The issue re flooding and drainage on the site would make the site unsuitable for the residential nature of a hotel and would render the solar panels ineffective if water-logged. Responders also note that the development of the site is likely to increase flooding elsewhere in the village and nearby buildings due to increased surface water runoff from the field. Concerns re current sewage infrastructure’s inability to cope with current demands, resulting in raw sewage running down nearby roads, without any additional burden.</li> <li>3. Responders concerned re road infrastructure’s ability to deal with current demands and that development will only increase the number of cars using the local roads and also cars parked in the local lanes and in field and property access points. Development will not only increase traffic, congestion, and delays, but further degrade air quality due to increased pollution and increase noise. Responders note that motorists try to avoid traffic by using smaller local lanes that are not designed to accommodate the volume of traffic, also causing dangerous driving. Concerns re safety around the roads as the area is an existing accident hotspot having poor visibility. Responders note that the congestion also stops emergency vehicles being able to pass the main arterial route. No provisions have been made for safe walking and cycling routes, causing concerns for the safety of pedestrians. The introduction of 20mph speed limits is ineffective as reducing speeding. It is noted that there may be a conflict between the traffic coming out of both the garden centre and proposed hotel.</li> <li>4. Responders note that the site is in an area that suffers from having no spare infrastructure and amenities locally to serve it, such as broadband, reliable public transport and playparks with existing infrastructure and amenities under further strain. Responders concerned that there are zero real plans for infrastructure and amenity improvement.</li> <li>5. Concerns re NHS services at max capacity with long wait times and no availability, and a lack of schools locally to keep up with demand, both issues that will only get worse with increased development.</li> <li>6. Scale Character identity Individuality. Concerns that the development of this site will compromise the identity and individuality of the local area is not in keeping with its historic nature. The proposed solar panels and hotel on the site is noted to be totally out of place for the quiet, rural land, and will overpower and dominate the nearby properties and approach to the conservation area of Mathern village.</li> <li>7. Concerns re the removal of an essential part of the green belt/ wedge between Pwllmeyric, Hayes Gate and Mathern if this site is developed also reducing the amount of land for agriculture in the area. Responders note development of this site to be inappropriate and contrary to Planning Policy Wales Edition 11, severely affecting the rural setting and landscape of the surrounding villages. Concern that a high security fence surrounding the site will transform the area into an industrial landscape. Despite the constant expansion of the garden centre site opposite, this is still a quiet rural area and not one of industry and should therefore be kept that way.</li> <li>8. Concerns re glare caused by the solar panels due to the site’s proximity to the A48 Pwllmeyric major road, its visibility, and its openness to the surrounding landscape. The light reflected by the solar panels could dazzle drivers and cause a road traffic accident. The site is also looked down upon from the garden centre also causing glare issues. Responders believe solar panel sites should be</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Mathern Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Mathern Community Council, Cllr Louise Brown plus 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Cllr Louise Brown plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. Cllr Louise Brown plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. Cllr Louise Brown plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>14. Mathern Community Council</li> <li>15. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>16. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>17. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>

	<p>in more isolated locations. Screening of the site will not be effective due to its lower position compared to the surrounding landscape.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Responders concerned that development are not sustainable or help to reducing the climate emergency, even with proposed mitigation strategies.</li> <li>10. Concerns that a hotel by its very nature will increase noise and disturbance at all hours of the day. A growth of people in this currently quiet area will also increase littering, nuisance, and antisocial behaviour. Responders living in close proximity to the site note that it would result in a loss of privacy for there property, with the hotel possibly overlooking and dominating smaller buildings.</li> <li>11. Responders believe there is no necessity for hotel accommodation in Pwllmeyric as there is already tourist accommodation at Mounton Brook Lodge, Willowbrook Guest House, Marriott St Pierre Hotel and Country Club, and the Two Rivers nearby.</li> <li>12. Responder notes that the site does not lie in the boundaries of any of the villages and is also not located in any of the Less Constrained Solar Area laid out in the RLDP.</li> <li>13. Development of the site would severely affect the conservation area of Mathern and Pwllmeyric and is not in keeping with this historic area.</li> <li>14. Responder noted that a hotel would be better placed in Chepstow, where it could help to regenerate the town.</li> <li>15. Responder notes that the allocation of this site only benefits the developers and makes them profit and that the site should not be allocated as Monmouthshire is not in a national growth area identified in Future Wales 2040.</li> <li>16. Concerns re the affordability of housing in the area and that those who work the jobs brought about by the development of the hotel would not be able to afford to live in the area, further contributing to issues surrounding commuting.</li> <li>17. Responder believes the consultation for the site should be extended as the site has not been highlighted to Chepstow, Pwllmeyric and Mather residents, being hidden in the rural plans.</li> </ol>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS0231 West of Shirenewton Recreation Hall (Smaller Site), Shirenewton</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED - HER details extensive prehistoric artefacts in the field and surrounding fields. Desk-based Assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</li> <li>3. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</li> <li>4. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village. Concerns re the footpath used to access the school becoming suburban and hemmed in by development.</li> <li>6. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Shirenewton Community Council plus 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> </ol>

	<p>Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</p> <p>7. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</p> <p>8. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</p> <p>9. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</p> <p>10. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency.</p> <p>11. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</p> <p>12. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</p> <p>13. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC's housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</p> <p>14. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</p> <p>15. Responder concerned that any alteration to the current drainage would adversely affect their property, causing erosion and undermining their boundary wall.</p>	<p>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 5 Private Individuals</p> <p>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</p> <p>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</p> <p>10. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>11. 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>12. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>13. Shirenewton Community Council</p> <p>14. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>15. 1 Private Individual</p>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0232 Land West of Redd Landes, Shirenewton</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED - HER details extensive prehistoric artefacts in the field and surrounding fields. Desk-based Assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</p> <p>2. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</p> <p>3. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</p> <p>4. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</p> <p>5. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village. Concerns re the footpath used to access the school becoming suburban and hemmed in by development.</p> <p>6. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and</p>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</p> <p>2. Shirenewton Community Council plus 5 Private Individuals</p> <p>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</p> <p>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</p> <p>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 8 Private Individuals</p>

	<p>pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</p> <p>7. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</p> <p>8. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</p> <p>9. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</p> <p>10. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency.</p> <p>11. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</p> <p>12. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</p> <p>13. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC's housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</p> <p>14. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</p> <p>15. Responders believe planned access is very dangerous as the hill is steep and the visibility is poor, posing an unacceptable level of risk.</p> <p>16. Responder is in support of the site as they believe the site is technically deliverable, viable and developable and meets the requirements of the Preferred Strategy. The site has sound access off the public highway and could be developed without significantly affecting the setting of the existing village. The site has demonstrated as having no constraints that cannot be mitigated against. The responder believes that housing can be provided in one of the most sustainable villages in the county and asks the LPA to allocate the site in the deposit LDP.</p>	<p>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</p> <p>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 5 Private Individuals</p> <p>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</p> <p>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</p> <p>10. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>11. 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>12. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>13. Shirenewton Community Council</p> <p>14. 1 Private Individual</p> <p>15. 2 Private Individuals</p> <p>16. 1 Private Individual</p>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0240 Land to the East of Mounton Court, Shirenewton</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – HER details prehistoric artefacts and crop mark enclosures in the surrounding fields. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</p> <p>2. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</p> <p>3. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</p>	<p>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</p> <p>2. Shirenewton Community Council plus 5 Private Individuals</p> <p>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village. Concerns re the footpath used to access the school becoming suburban and hemmed in by development.</li> <li>6. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</li> <li>7. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</li> <li>8. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</li> <li>9. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</li> <li>10. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency.</li> <li>11. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</li> <li>12. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</li> <li>13. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC's housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</li> <li>14. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</li> <li>15. Responder believes the village of Shirenewton has no opportunity for sustainable growth in terms of employment.</li> <li>16. Responder believes sites in rural areas should be allocated for self-build bungalows for a retiring population, freeing up existing family homes in the area. Responder also believes that a rural village is not the place to build affordable homes for young people and notes that they will be better served by a town with more facilities, access to transport and a wider availability of services.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Shirenewton Community Council</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>16. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0240 Land to the East of Mounton Court, Shirenewton</b>	<b>Representor:</b>	
<b>Summary of Main</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – HER details prehistoric artefacts and crop mark enclosures in the surrounding fields. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> </ol>

Issues Raised:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</li> <li>3. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</li> <li>4. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village. Concerns re the footpath used to access the school becoming suburban and hemmed in by development.</li> <li>6. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</li> <li>7. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</li> <li>8. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</li> <li>9. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</li> <li>10. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency.</li> <li>11. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</li> <li>12. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</li> <li>13. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC's housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</li> <li>14. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</li> <li>15. Responder believes the village of Shirenewton has no opportunity for sustainable growth in terms of employment.</li> <li>16. Responder believes sites in rural areas should be allocated for self-build bungalows for a retiring population, freeing up existing family homes in the area. Responder also believes that a rural village is not the place to build affordable homes for young people and notes that they will be better served by a town with more facilities, access to transport and a wider availability of services.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Shirenewton Community Council plus 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 4 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Shirenewton Community Council</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>16. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>



Candidate Site: CS0244 Land West of Ditch Hill Lane, Shirenewton	Representor:
<p><b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as RED – Coxe’s Well marked at the eastern periphery, other springs marked on historical mapping; the Well is marked as a Brake on the Tithe Map. HER details extensive prehistoric artefacts and cropmarks, and enclosure of potential Iron Age / Roman date in the field and surrounding fields. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work.</li> <li>2. Concern re previous flooding in relation to drainage and sewerage management, with fields being flooded with raw sewerage from existing residents, and the implications caused by a new development on the site.</li> <li>3. Concerns re lack of current infrastructure in the village such as public transport, broadband, shop, pub, post office, which will be even more insufficient after this site is developed.</li> <li>4. The school has reached its maximum capacity and NHS service are being overwhelmed by current demands, which will only be exacerbated by a large increase in residents.</li> <li>5. Concerns re the scale and over-bearing plans of new developments in proportion to the existing village and therefore its character and appearance, and a reduction in the open aspect of the village and its existing views, significantly expanding the size of the village.</li> <li>6. Concerns re an increase in traffic on the rural roads, as the only option for new residents would be to access facilities in neighbouring villages and towns using private vehicles. Adding more traffic because of an increase in residents will exacerbate congestion and pollution, there are no public charging points for electric vehicles and current infrastructure to support these schemes are not complete and plans are yet to be produced. Also concerns re the lack of safe pedestrian footpaths in the village and to walk to Chepstow and no dedicated cycle route as the country lanes can be dangerous for everyone. Responders note that the development will decrease access to the area and that there is already an issue with speeding. Because of the remote nature of the site and its lack of links to centres and amenities only further increases the necessity to use cars for transport.</li> <li>7. Responders note that the development of the site would mean the loss of valuable green wedge land, important to the villages distinct sense of place and identity. The green space maintains the distinction between the countryside and the settlements and protects the open character and landscape of the area. It is also noted that the green space greatly benefits humans and wildlife and is an important component of the wildlife reserve. Concerned re development of grade one agriculture land being in contrast to the views of Future Wales 2040 which, prioritises the development of Newport, Cardiff, and the Valleys.</li> <li>8. Concern re site being outside of defined village development boundary and would extend the village envelope.</li> <li>9. Concerns re the villages lack of opportunities for sustainable growth in terms of employment as there are no SMEs to provide jobs.</li> <li>10. Responders fail to see how development in the village will help the climate emergency.</li> <li>11. Concerns of significant adverse effects on current residential amenity, by reason of noise disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc.</li> <li>12. Responder notes that local consultation should take place on the options before any individual sites are considered for inclusion in the allocation.</li> <li>13. Concerns that the proposed candidate site is capable under MCC’s housing density policy of up to 26 units, which, is far more than the settlement average.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>2. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Shirenewton Community Council plus 8 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Shirenewton Community Council plus 7 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. Shirenewton Community Council plus 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. Shirenewton Community Council plus 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. Shirenewton Community Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>10. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>11. 3 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Shirenewton Community Council</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. Cllr Louise Brown</li> </ol>

	<p>14. Responder believes the proposal to be alienating the people who have moved to the countryside for all of its benefits, driving them somewhere else and reducing the desirability of the village. This is detrimental to Monmouthshire and will take away the key reasons as to why residents want to live in Shirenewton.</p> <p>15. Responder notes that the site is surrounded by the indicative green belt in Future Wales Plan 2040 and therefore, development would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales Edition 11. The site would also be too close to Mynydbach and there needs to be a distinction between the two.</p>	
<b>St Arvans</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0003 Livox Quarry</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red. The HER notes finds of prehistoric date, and Medieval and post-medieval artefacts also. Outside but near to the boundary are Scheduled Monuments of Roman and Modern date. Desk-based assessment and geophysical survey prior to any determination of an application would inform mitigation, which may include further pre-determination work. Also within the Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest of the Lower Wye Valley, in character area HLCA007 Livox Farm, consult Cadw regarding the need for an ASIDOHL to determine the impact on this.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeologic Trust Ltd</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CS0077 Adj Piercefield Public House, St Arvans</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. HER notes route of a Roman road at the east of the site area marked as orchard on historic mapping. Development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.</li> <li>A responder states that the land provides habitat for wildlife including badgers, hedgehogs, bats, owls and mice, all of which would face a loss of habitat if the site was developed as all other local fields are used for livestock and are therefore unsuitable for this wildlife.</li> <li>Concerns regarding capacity of the water treatment plant.</li> <li>Concerns as the access for the site is likely to be opposite a busy pre-school nursery and other entrances and junctions on this busy road.</li> <li>SEWRIGS group state that the site lies within the Otter Hole RIGS on Datamap Wales, but the site is listed for the Otter Hole Cave system underground. The impact of proposed developments will depend on the nature of the RIGS feature, so early consultation with the local RIGS group or NRW is strongly recommended.</li> <li>A responder states that the land has not been used for agricultural purposes for many but is largely abandoned and is known to have Japanese knotweed in several locations.</li> <li>Concerns regarding a loss of privacy to properties and gardens.</li> <li>The site sponsor, Marston's PLC, has submitted supporting information and makes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Flood Consequence Assessment &amp; Drainage Strategy was commissioned which confirms that the site is considered appropriate for residential purposes in terms of national and local planning policy for flood risk.</li> <li>Following assessment through a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment the Illustrative Masterplan has emerged which ensures that the proposed development would assimilate carefully into its surrounds and would avoid any harm to the AONB.</li> <li>The site is located immediately adjacent to the A466 and also benefits from having bus stops immediately adjacent.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd</li> <li>1 Private Individual</li> <li>1 Private Individual</li> <li>1 Private Individual</li> <li>SEWRIGS group plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>1 Private Individual</li> <li>1 Private Individual</li> <li>Marston's PLC</li> </ol>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Viability Assessment demonstrated that the proposals could meet all S106 obligations and infrastructure requirements including 50% affordable housing.</li> <li>• The Illustrative Masterplan demonstrates that the site would be GI led in excess of 40% on site and would provide opportunities for biodiversity habitat and net-gain.</li> <li>• St Arvans is one of the most disproportionately aging communities in the County and so growth of the village through delivery of the site would serve to meet the requirements of local planning policy relating to demographic rebalancing of rural communities.</li> <li>• A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal concluded that the proposals have sought to minimise impacts and subject to the implementation of appropriate avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures, it is unlikely that the proposals will result in significant harm to biodiversity.</li> </ul>	
<b>Candidate Site: CS00223 Land at New Barn Workshop, St Arvans</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. HER notes route of a Roman road at the north of the site; adjoining field has find spots of prehistoric and 8 <sup>th</sup> century artefacts. Development could be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeologic Trust Ltd
<b>Trellech</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0092 Monmouth Road, Trellech</b>		
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Amber. Following archaeological field evaluation, it was recommended that development be mitigated by condition, in accordance with an agreed Written Scheme of Historic Environment Mitigation.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd
<b>Candidate Site: CS0234 East of De Clere Way, Trellech</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd assess the site as Red – Partly with the Trellech Archaeologically Sensitive Area, archaeological evaluation adjacent encountered Medieval remains. Geophysical survey and field evaluation prior to determination of any application.	1. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Ltd
<b>Werngifford Pandy</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CS0219 Land at Sun Meadow</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
	No responses received.	

## Candidate Sites for Protection

Abergavenny & Llanfoist		
Candidate Site: CSP001 Gavenny Valley, Abergavenny		Representor:
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support for inclusion as part of a policy for a Green Wedge buffer between the built-up area and the National Park and to protect the lower sides of the Gavenny Valley between the built-up area and the railway/A465 from further development.</li> <li>2. Responders state that the steeply sloping wooded lower part of the site is a SINCE including floodplains which have their own unique biodiversity and a developed species hierarchy.</li> <li>3. Concerns that the site is partly liable to flood, absorbing excess rainfall which prevents flooding of existing homes and the risk of subsidence.</li> <li>4. Concerns that an ancient woodland SSSI crosses the site providing an east-west wildlife corridor. Development would require access from Ross Road via a small area of level field and a breach in the SSSI. There are many trees on site subject to TPOs.</li> <li>5. Concern about the impact of any development on the river quality. The river supports many species, some protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, such as brown trout, otters, white-clawed crayfish, kingfishers, dippers, various birds of prey and various bats.</li> <li>6. Abergavenny Town Council state that the site is within the setting of St Teilo's Church, a Grade 1 Listed Building. A responder also mentions the presence of World War 2 Pill Boxes and an Air Raid Shelter which should be preserved.</li> <li>7. Responders state that the preservation of this site supports MCC, Welsh Government and NRW environmental policies and addresses the Climate and Nature Emergencies called by WG.</li> <li>8. Responders state that the site provides access to dark skies.</li> <li>9. Responders state that the woodland helps to reduce noise from the A465.</li> <li>10. Responders state that the site provides valuable amenity space giving easy access to beautiful walks benefiting both mental and physical wellbeing. A responder believes the site meets DES2 criteria.</li> <li>11. Responders state that the site provides uninterrupted countryside views to Skirrid Mountain; development would alter the skyline for the worse.</li> <li>12. Responders state that the previous MCC Ecological Site Assessment (previous LDP/CS0054) recommended that the development of a high proportion of the site should be avoided.</li> <li>13. Responders state that the site is important for tourism in the area, supporting existing holiday accommodation. Feedback from visitors confirms appreciation for this unspoilt area so close to the town.</li> <li>14. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society suggest the site may be Grade 3a agricultural land.</li> <li>15. Concerns for the loss of undeveloped land; brownfield sites should be developed.</li> <li>16. Concerns for the increase in traffic and pollution that development would bring.</li> <li>17. Concerns for building more homes when a number of houses in the area remain unoccupied.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abergavenny Town Council plus 16 Private Individuals</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society plus 15 Private Individuals</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, plus 16 Private Individuals</li> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society plus 20 Private Individuals</li> <li>5. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society, plus 23 Private Individuals</li> <li>6. Abergavenny Town Council plus 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. 10 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. 6 Private Individuals</li> <li>9. 10 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 13 Private Individuals</li> <li>11. 5 Private Individuals</li> <li>12. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>13. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>14. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>15. 5 Private Individual</li> <li>16. 5 Private Individual</li> <li>17. 2 Private Individuals</li> </ol>
Candidate Site: CSP002 Western Abergavenny		Responder:
<b>Summary of Main</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support for protection as a buffer to the National Park; to be retained as a Green Wedge.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 2 Private Individuals</li> </ol>

<b>Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council and Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society state that the site forms the National Park buffer zone proposal which could allow for a trunk road by-pass.</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council and Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society raise concerns that a flood risk from mountain streams may impact any development on the site.</li> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society state that the site is Grade 3a agricultural land quality.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council, Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> <li>4. Abergavenny &amp; District Civic Society</li> </ol>
<b>Candidate Site: CSP003 Land at Pentre Road, Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support for protection as a buffer to the National Park; to be retained as a Green Wedge.</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council state that the site is steeply sloped and prominent to views from the south with no mitigating green infrastructure that would help to absorb any development into the landscape.</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council state that a thick hedgerow on the western boundary must be safeguarded.</li> <li>4. Responders feel that the woodland is an important element of the town's green infrastructure.</li> <li>5. Responders state that the site offers iconic views of The Sugar Loaf Mountain and along with the unspoilt nature of the landscape is a key asset to Abergavenny's tourism.</li> <li>6. Responders state that the site on the border of the Abergavenny Conservation Area and that four of the eleven fields which constitute the site are registered as SINCs. The fields are therefore of very high ecological value, supporting a high level of natural wildlife including birds of prey and mammals, and should be protected.</li> <li>7. Concerns that residential development will increase light pollution adversely affecting nocturnal wildlife in the BBNP.</li> <li>8. SOUL state that many of the lanes which surround or cross the site are single track providing excellent conditions for walking and exercise.</li> <li>9. Responders state that these lanes provide access to The Sugar Loaf, St Mary's Vale and The Vineyard for serious walkers, visiting tourists and locals and act as a natural boundary between the town development and the countryside.</li> <li>10. A responder states that the site provides connectivity with the green infrastructure of the town – linking the National Park and Conservation Area designations to the town's green spaces.</li> <li>11. There is concern that allowing development at this site would set a precedent for other sites in the area.</li> <li>12. Responders felt that the site is has no local shops and only a two-hourly bus service and that any residential development would be up to 2km from the town centre services.</li> <li>13. Traffic issues were raised with concerns that any development would increase traffic and may require a new junction with the A40. Access would be through narrow, often single lane, streets which are not suitable for through traffic. These narrow lanes would make Active Travel difficult.</li> <li>14. Concerns re pollution from an increase in traffic from development.</li> <li>15. Concerns that there is no infrastructure to support any development here, no extra jobs, schools, shops, medical facilities.</li> <li>16. Concerns re drainage problems in the area and the increased risk of run-off water during heavy rainfall.</li> <li>17. The 11 fields, which occupy the proposed Green Wedge, are of high quality land offering grazing to horses, cattle and sheep.</li> <li>18. Better development options are available on the site east of the A465, and the railway station, and vacant buildings, and brownfield sites, within the town could be utilised.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abergavenny Town Council, SOUL, 208 Private Individuals</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council plus 7 Private Individual</li> <li>3. Abergavenny Town Council</li> <li>4. Abergavenny Town Council, 1 Private Individual</li> <li>5. SOUL, 19 Private Individual</li> <li>6. SOUL plus 17 Private Individuals</li> <li>7. 2 Private Individuals</li> <li>8. SOUL plus 12 Private Individual</li> <li>9. SOUL, 10 Private Individuals</li> <li>10. 2 Private Individual</li> <li>11. Abergavenny Town Council</li> <li>12. Abergavenny Town Council plus 2 Private Individual</li> <li>13. Abergavenny Town Council plus 14 Private Individual</li> <li>14. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>15. 2 Private Individual</li> <li>16. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>17. 5 Private Individual</li> <li>18. 3 Private Individual</li> </ol>

<b>Candidate Site: CSP004 Land north of Abergavenny</b>		<b>Responder:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support for protection as a buffer to the National Park; to be retained as a Green Wedge.</li> <li>2. Concerns were raised regarding the slope of the site, and its prominence in views from the east, and the lack of green infrastructure to help it blend into the landscape.</li> <li>3. A responder states that the area is of high visual landscape importance, highly visible from popular tourist routes to the Sugarloaf. It provides the setting for the National Park, with iconic views towards the Sugarloaf Mountain and St Mary's Vale as well as the setting for the Abergavenny Conservation Area. It also provides connectivity with the green infrastructure of the town, linking the National Park, Conservation Area designations and the town's green spaces such as Bailey Park.</li> <li>4. SOUL state that four of the eleven fields which constitute the site are registered as SINCs. Development of this site would have a negative effect on the Conservation Area which abuts it.</li> <li>5. SOUL state that many of the lanes which surround or cross the site are single track providing excellent conditions for walking and exercise.</li> <li>6. SOUL state that these lanes provide access to The Sugar Loaf, St Mary's Vale and The Vineyard for serious walkers, visiting tourists and locals.</li> <li>7. Traffic issues were raised with concerns that any development would increase traffic on Old Hereford Road which would further overload Pen y Pound and its junction with the A40.</li> <li>8. Responders suggest that the slope of the site might render substantial Active Travel unlikely and would limit access to existing shops and of the town centre by foot, therefore, requiring a frequent bus service / increased use of the car.</li> <li>9. There is concern that allowing development at this site would set a precedent for other sites in the area.</li> <li>10. The woodland is an important element of the town's green infrastructure as an extension to the Deri woodlands and prominent from the east.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abergavenny Town Council, SOUL plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>2. Abergavenny Town Council plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>3. SOUL plus 1 Private Individual</li> <li>4. SOUL</li> <li>5. SOUL</li> <li>6. SOUL</li> <li>7. Abergavenny Town Council</li> <li>8. Abergavenny Town Council</li> <li>9. Abergavenny Town Council</li> <li>10. Abergavenny Town Council</li> </ol>
<b>Chepstow</b>		
<b>Candidate Site: CSP017 Land at Bayfield, Chepstow</b>		<b>Representor:</b>
<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support for the proposal to protect this site - the site should be protected to maintain the open field, rolling landscape which creates a visual distinction between town and the recognised AONB and ancient woodland.</li> <li>2. Concerns that development on land abutting an AONB could set a precedent for building on other sites like this and destroy what makes Monmouthshire so special.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1 Private Individual</li> <li>2. 1 Private Individual</li> </ol>