

DC/2016/00883

MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OF 13.8 HECTARES OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL USE AND EMPLOYMENT USE; UP TO 266 PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND APPROXIMATELY 5575 SQUARE METRES of B1 FLOOR SPACE.

ROCKFIELD FARM, UNDY, NP26 3EL

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Andrew Jones
Date Registered: 15.08.2016

1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

- 1.1 This application is for up to 266 dwellings and approximately 5575 square metres of employment land (Use Class B1). Policy S3 sets out seven strategic sites that will meet a substantial part of the need for new housing allocations indicated in the table accompanying Policy S2. This is one of those sites and is allocated under Policy SA5 for around 270 dwellings and for 2 hectares of serviced land for industrial and business development. The application is submitted as outline, approval is sought for access only with all other matters reserved.
- 1.2 The application site is located on the northern side of Undy between the Rockfield Grove housing estate and the M4 motorway. Its topography is gently undulating with the land falling either side of a ridge that runs through the site in a south-west to north-east direction. The site comprises five irregular shaped fields, with low-cut hedge boundaries, often with gaps. There are a number of hedgerows within the site and a woodland corridor, named Breezy Bank, situated to the west of the farmstead. This is recognised as a site of importance for nature conservation (SINC).
- 1.3 The 13.8 ha site is irregular in shape, measuring approximately 620m in length and 280m at its widest point. The boundaries of the site are defined by the M4 motorway, housing to the south and field boundaries to the west and east.
- 1.4 A minor adopted road, The Elms, runs northward from the Rockfield Grove housing estate through the centre of the site and currently provides the site's only means of vehicular access. To the south-west lies the village of Magor which adjoins Undy. The B4245 abuts the south-east corner of the site and further to the south runs the main railway line.
- 1.5 The land form of the site rises from around 10m AOD at the south-east corner (along B4542) to a high point of about 43m AOD at the south-west corner of the site, and slopes gently to the north.
- 1.6 The masterplan sets out the distribution of land uses which illustrate the extent and location of the built development area. It indicatively divides the site into 4 key areas that would see the residential area concentrated to the southerly part of the site due to the retention of the SINC and the requirement to provide a safeguarding area for the M4 Relief Road to the north. The residential area would also deliver 25% affordable housing units (67 units). The density of the development calculated on the net residential area (plus associated highway infrastructure and formal public open space) would give an

average density of 33 dwellings per hectare. It is indicated that the development would be compromised of a mixture of 2 and 3 storey dwellings.

- 1.7 Primary vehicular and pedestrian access will be taken from the B4245 at the south-east corner of the site by virtue of a new priority T junction. Within the site there will be new highway infrastructure including a new local link road that would join the new access at the B4245 to the western boundary whereby it would lead into the adjoining strategic housing site (SAH6) at Vinegar Hill. A number of pedestrian links are also proposed to be created including leading to The Elms to the south, the play area at Rockfield View to the west and to the allotment area to the eastern boundary.
- 1.8 As detail in Section 1.2 part of the site is designated as a SINC, accordingly a number of Ecological surveys have been undertaken including an extended phase 1 habitat survey (which highlighted the potential presence of legally-protected species badger, dormouse, owls, nesting birds and reptiles). Further ecological survey work undertaken in January 2016 confirmed the presence of badger setts within the SINC.
- 1.9 In addition a Tree Survey has also been submitted with the application, it noted that the majority of trees and groups are located around the edges of the site and should not be unduly affected by development proposals. The survey also highlights the presence of a mature oak tree covered by a tree preservation order (TPO MCC 223) located to the south west of Rockfield Farm and the Breezy Bank woodland corridor.
- 1.10 A Transport Assessment in support of the application has been received, the modelling work considered the likely impact of additional traffic associated with development of the Vinegar Hill site and the impact of plans to develop a new M4 relief road around Newport. The assessment looks at two options for providing access to the site from the B4245 - one being a priority T-junction and the other a three-arm roundabout. The results of the assessment indicate that a priority T-junction designed to the same standard as Rockfield Grove would operate within capacity in all scenarios.
- 1.11 Other supporting survey work undertaken includes an Archaeological Field Evaluation, Air Quality Assessment and Noise Assessment.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DC/1994/00633 - Erection Of A Freestanding Lattice Telecommunications Mast/Pole Maximum 15 Metres In Height, On Top Of Which 2 No Omni-directional Antennae And 1 No Dish Antenna Will Be Installed. Refused 21/07/1994.

3.0 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Strategic Planning Policies

- S1 – Spatial Distribution of New Residential Development
- S2 – Housing Provision
- S3 – Strategic Housing Sites
- S4 – Affordable Housing Provision
- S5 – Community and Recreation Facilities
- S12 – Efficient Resource Use and Flood Risk
- S13 – Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment
- S16 – Transport
- S17 – Place Making and Design
- SAH5 – Rockfield Farm, Undy

Development Management Policies

H1 – Residential Development in Main Towns, Severnside Settlements and Rural Secondary Settlements
CRF2 – Outdoor Recreation / Public Open Space and Allotment Standards and Provision
SD2 – Sustainable Construction and Energy Efficiency
SD4 – Sustainable Drainage
DES1 – General Design Considerations
EP1 – Amenity and Environmental Protection
NE1- Nature Conservation and Development
GI1 – Green Infrastructure
EP5 – Foul Sewage Disposal
MV1 – Proposed Developments and Highway Considerations
MV2 – Sustainable Transport Access
MV3 – Public Rights of Way

4.0 REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Consultation Replies

Magor with Undy Community Council – Recommends refusal, making the following observations.

General Amenities & Services

The Communities of Magor and Undy, over the last twenty years have had more than their fair share of development. In 1975 The “Magor and Undy - Expansion of Two Villages” document was produced by the former Gwent County Council, and later adopted by Monmouthshire County Council. It stated that in 1969 a detailed village plan was prepared so that forethought could be given to the services needed as the population of the villages increased from 1,000 to 5,000. To quote “The plan further provided for the villages of Magor and Undy to grow into one well planned community in such a way that urban sprawl is avoided and the attractive rural setting of the villages is respected”. This has certainly not been the case, and there are no more facilities here now than there were 30 or 40 years ago when the population was closer to 400. The community is lacking in public amenities, services and highway infrastructure. It still has inadequate car parking available adjacent to the village hub, a lack of parking at nearby railway station at Rogiet, no railway station of its own, inadequate public transport e.g. buses. There is no pedestrian/cycle track to Rogiet. The Doctor and Dentist Surgeries are full to capacity, and the provision of facilities to the Elderly and especially statutory Youth provision is greatly lacking and failing, not to mention a lack of general amenities e.g. supermarket, library, leisure/community centre, as well as the lack of burial space and the capacity within the Dwr Cymru Welsh Water infrastructure to dispose of foul waste. Whilst the Unitary Authority is currently investing in a 21st Century School at Caldicot, both the Magor and Undy Primary Schools are full to capacity.

Green Public Open Space

The proposed site covers an area of approximately 13.8 hectares of prime agricultural land with a classification of between 3a and 3c. The Ashley Godfrey Report (2008) criticised the lack, and deficiency of green space for public use, and the lack of leisure facilities in Magor and Undy. This has not changed. If this deficit cannot be remedied now, it is unlikely to be remedied when in excess of 55 acres of green fields are devastated for the purpose of developing houses and light industry.

The Community Council note that the 'buffer zone' of amenity land (between Rockfield Way and the new development) as shown on the initial plans during your public consultation in June 2015 appears to have disappeared from the current proposals. Why? The provision of green public open space is essential to the Health and Well-being of any community. Why have Monmouthshire County Council continually eaten away and the available green public open spaces available to the community of Magor with Undy? Is Monmouthshire County Council going to make available an alternative Green Public Open Space? Where?

The Council has certainly not made allowance for it within this new development.

Traffic Management & Noise

The building of a further 266 dwellings (plus what can be expected at Vinegar Hill) in the community of Magor with Undy would put increased pressure on the B4245 the SAR and M4 junction 23A, as well as other road in the villages. Overall this could mean a further 800 -1000 cars in the vicinity, which would only serve to exacerbate the situation for traffic joining/leaving the B4245 and increase the traffic flow along the B4245.

The Community Council believe that the plans submitted do nothing to quell the fears of the public regarding the access/egress of traffic onto the B4245. This is a particularly problematic corner of the B4245 where traffic travels at excessive speeds on the westbound highway around the corner. The siting of the entrance to the new development will cause similar problems now on the eastbound highway. What plans are there to manage the access/egress of traffic at this point? Are there plans to install a traffic light system? Will there be a pedestrian crossing facility? How will any proposals impact on the current access/egress to Rockfield Grove and Church Road? Increased traffic on the B4245 will have a detrimental effect on pedestrian safety, in particular the Safe Routes to School. There are already concerns for safety on the B4245 Westbound pedestrian footway at Little Hill, as well as concerns for cyclists (and pedestrians) connecting with Severn Tunnel Railway Station at Rogiet along the B4245 following the failure of Monmouthshire County Council to secure funding to put in place a much needed pedestrian/cyclist route along the B4245 between Magor and Rogiet Even back in 1975 a 'by-pass' was promised to alleviate the B4245 of through traffic. However, the plans submitted for consideration appear to now exclude the original proposal for a 'by-pass' as mentioned by yourselves at the planning inquiry. Has this by-pass now disappeared from the plans due to lack of funds?

Councillors note too, that the siting of the proposed B1 employment use land has been changed. This new proposal, as set out in your plans, will mean that any traffic/deliveries for the employment units will have to traverse the residential units first. This is not ideal, and would only add to issues with Safe Routes to School, pedestrian safety and access/egress onto the B4245.

Councillors understand that following the noise assessment, part of the site is a category E. This is unacceptable for a residential area.

Environment, Historical Value

Councillors note that the Unitary Authority as both the "Planning Authority" and the "Developer" has undertaken various environmental studies. Will the Unitary Authority take on board on the comments contained within the reports? Will the Unitary Authority ensure that all dwellings are 'bat friendly'? Will they ensure all recommendations are taken on board?

The Unitary Authority is also undertaking various archaeology investigations. What are the plans of the Unitary Authority should a significant discovery be made on this site? It must be borne in mind, that Rockfield was an ideal place (high solid ground) for a settlement prior to the Gwent Levels being drained by the Romans i.e. within access

to the 'water and trade highway' of the Severn Estuary whilst being out or reach of flooding by the same. There have been recent 'Roman' finds in the area, and among the older members of the villages there have been tales of other, perhaps older, settlements. What are the plans of the Unitary Authority should there be any finds made? Will the Unitary Authority discuss any finds with the Community Council, and to how best preserve and/or record? Will members of the public be afforded the opportunity to see for themselves? Or will the presence of any finds just be recorded by the archaeologists prior to being covered back over before being built on?

SECTION 106 AND/OR COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

No indication has been made within the plans as to the provision of s.106 monies or the new CIL monies, apart from the indication that Adult recreation (pitch sports) is 'assumed off-site'. As both Planning Authority and Developer at present surely the Planning Authority has some indication of whether s.106 and or CIL will be available and as to its usage.

Layout of Site

Firstly, the siting of the B1 area is not conducive to effective planning – deliveries will need to travel through residential area before reaching their destination.

Community Open space is proposed at less than 0.27 hectares. This is not acceptable for a community that already has less than the recommended amount of green open public space.

Children's play areas proposed within the housing complex are for an area of 0.53 hectares. Small, inadequate children's play sites do not work, and ten years down the line are a problem to maintain to high standards. Monmouthshire County Council Direct Services have already experienced this problem. It would be far better to consult with the Community Council about enhancing strategic play park sites.

Making the most of, and improving the sites that are already within the community, and utilising one larger concentrated site within the new development.

Adult recreation (pitch sports) is noted as 'assumed off-site'. Where? What? When?

The whole proposed site does not show any connectivity to the rest of the villages apart from the access/egress onto the B4245 and on to the Old Elms Road.

Councillors note that the design and access statement indicates that there will be residential dwellings of both 2 and 3 storey in height. There are no proposed single storey residential dwellings. The proposal for 3 storey buildings on what is already elevated ground will have a detrimental visual impact on the development making it stand out against the skyline, setting it apart from the character of the existing neighbourhood. This could result in the development appearing over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. It would further adversely affect the residential amenity of existing neighbouring properties.

The proposal appears to be of unacceptably high density and possibly overdevelopment of the site which could have an impact and adverse effect of the preservation, protection, character and appearance of the nearby Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

The Community Council feel that the Unitary Authority with its 'developers' hat on have made several changes to the proposals it went out to consultation to the public with in June 2015. At that time members of the Magor with Undy Community were promised a further consultation and drop in session. This has not happened. Is it time to undertake further drop-in sessions for members of the public, indicating the changes that have been made to the original plan. A drop-in session with a model of the proposed site would be beneficial not only to members of the public, but to members of the Community Council too.

The Community Council trust that the Unitary Authority will, with their 'dual' hat on take into consideration the questions asked, and the comments made herein.

The Community Council believe that development of this site cannot take place until such time that the necessary amenities, services and infrastructures are put in place. To build the development without first putting in place the structure required to sustain the development would be like putting the 'cart before the horse'.

The Community Council cannot therefore support this outline planning application presently as there are no firm plans in place to develop, put in place and/or improve the various amenities, services and infrastructures prior to the building going ahead, and there are still questions unanswered.

MCC Planning Policy – provided the following comments:

The site is allocated in Policy SAH5 of the Local Development Plan for around 270 dwellings and 2 hectares of serviced land for industrial and business development. Strategic Policy S4 relates to Affordable Housing Provision and states that in Severnside Settlements there is a requirement for 25% of the total number of dwellings on the site to be affordable. While the application relates to 266 units it is noted there is an existing dwelling on site, the net gain is therefore 265. The provision of 66 affordable units relates to 25% of 265 and therefore complies with policy S4 and SAH5 in principle.

The inclusion of 2ha to provide 5575m² B1(b) Research and Development complies with criterion (b) of SAH5 in principle. The S.106 agreement must include details of this to ensure this does relate to serviced industrial and business land.

Strategic Policy S13 relating to Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment is of importance. Policy LC5 relating to the protection and enhancement of landscape character must also be considered, it is noted a LVIA has been included with the application. Additionally Policy GI1 should be referred to in relation to Green Infrastructure (GI). Information relating to GI has been submitted as part of the master plan report/design and access statement. The GI team will no doubt provide more detailed comments in this relation to these matters. There is a SINC located within the site, it is noted the masterplan provides additional formal open space in this locality complying with criterion (c) of Policy SAH5. Policy NE1 relating to Nature Conservation and Development must also be considered, it is noted an extended Phase 1 habitat and species assessment has been undertaken, liaison with the Councils Biodiversity Officer is advised in relation to this.

Policy DES2 relates to Areas of Amenity Importance. The site extends to the south of the allocated SAH5 site boundary into an area of DES2 land. The majority of the DES2 land in this location is private farmland with no public access and no logical boundary. The land does not fulfil an amenity role, it was previously included as a buffer between the edge of the settlement and the indicative Magor/Undy By-pass link. There is no justification for this buffer to continue to be designated as an Area of Amenity Importance. In addition to this in relation to the adjacent allocation at Vinegar Hill the LDP Inspector stated in para 6.59 of the Inspector's Report that 'The southern margin of the site is currently designated as an Area of Amenity Importance and thus subject to Policy DES2. This designation was made, at least partially, to provide a buffer for the safeguarded route of the B4245 Magor/Undy By-Pass. It is now intended that this would take a meandering and traffic-calmed course through the site and that the need for a buffer would thus be negated (IMAC13)'. Further to this the Council provided similar comments on this issue in the Vinegar Hill Examination Statement, para 6.3 noted 'It is recognised that the development of the site will result in the loss of an area of amenity open space. However, open space and green space will be incorporated in

the development. Provision for open space will be sought in accordance with the standards set out in LDP Policy CRF2 Outdoor Recreation/ Public Open Space/ Allotment Standards and Provision. Landscaping / planting will also be incorporated into the site making an important contribution to the provision of green space in the development. With regard to the area of amenity open space acting as a buffer to the proposed by-pass, it is anticipated that this road would be routed through the site with a sinuous and traffic calming design, therefore reducing the need for the buffer.' Similar considerations apply in relation to this allocation. It is considered, therefore, that there is no conflict with Policy DES2. It is also relevant that Magor has a surplus of public amenity open space when assessed against standards, although there is a deficiency in pitches for outdoor sport.

Policy CRF2 should be considered relating to outdoor recreation/public open space/allotment standards and provision. The policy requires outdoor playing space at a standard of 2.4 hectares per 1,000 population and 0.4 hectares of public open space per 1,000 population. It is noted that a total area of 0.8 hectares of open space is included in the proposal in the form of open space and children's play, which complies with the standard. The table on page 39 of the Master Plan Report/ Design and Access Statement notes that 1.06ha is required for pitch sports and it is assumed this will be provided off-site. Criterion (e) of Policy SAH5 states a S.106 should include provision for making an enhanced financial contribution to community facilities in the Magor/Undy area in addition to standard requirements. Financial contributions will be needed in lieu of on-site provision of outdoor recreation facilities. In addition, the last paragraph of Policy CRF2 also states that any development exceeding 50 dwelling units per site, should make provision for allotments if required in accordance with the standards set out in the policy. This has not been considered within the application. Colleagues in the landscape/recreation team will no doubt provide comment in relation to these matters. Again, these are matters that will need to be considered in any planning obligation / heads of terms.

Strategic Policy S17 relating to Place Making and Design should also be considered along with Policy DES1 in relation to General Design. Criterion i) of DES1 requires a minimum net density of 30 dwellings per hectare in order to ensure the most efficient use of land. While the site extends to the south of the original allocation the residential element relates to approximately 35 dwellings per hectare satisfying criterion i) of Policy DES1 in principle.

Policy EP1 relating to Amenity and Environmental Protection should also be considered most notably in relation to noise, the residential areas are suitably positioned away from the motorway.

Policy MV1 should be referred to with regard to access and car parking. Policy MV2 relating to highway considerations and sustainable transport access is also of relevance. Policy MV2 states that, where deemed necessary, financial requirements will be required towards improvements in transport infrastructure and services, in particular to support sustainable travel links / public transport, cycling and walking. Criterion (d) of Policy SAH5 also states a S.106 agreement will be required for provision for any necessary off-site highway improvements to the highway network through Magor/Undy in addition to standard requirements. This matter must be considered in any planning obligation / heads of terms. It is noted a Traffic Impact Assessment has been submitted and colleagues in the highways section have commented on these matters. It had been anticipated during the LDP process that impacts on the B4245/ East Facing Steelworks Road Slips (roundabout) junction would require the provision of a signalled junction in order to comply with criterion (d). If the

TIA is indicating that this is no longer a requirement then there would be no conflict with criterion (d).

Policy MV10 relates to the safeguarding of a route for the Magor/Undy By-pass, the route of which runs through the allocated site. Criterion f) of Policy SAH5 also requires the safeguarding of this route. It is noted that the TIA concludes that 'The assessment has also demonstrated that safeguarding a route for a Magor/Undy by-pass to the south of the site as set out in the LDP is not necessary to facilitate the Rockfield Farm development in any of the development scenarios tested.' Compliance with this element of criterion f), therefore, would no longer be required and the extension of the site to the south of the original SAH5 allocation into this location is considered acceptable.

Policies SD2 and SD4 relating to Sustainable Construction and Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Drainage respectively must also be considered. Policy S3, Strategic Housing Sites, requires that any detailed application for development shall include a feasibility assessment for suitable renewable energy and low or zero carbon technologies that could be incorporated into the development proposals. This information is not contained within the application.

Finally, the Council is currently progressing the implementation of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). At present it is envisaged that CIL could be adopted in Spring 2016. If the planning application is successful and approved after the adoption of CIL then the development could be liable to the payment of a CIL charge, in this location the proposed CIL rate is £80 per square metre. Should planning permission be granted after the adoption of CIL then it is accepted that Section 106 contributions will need to be reconsidered.

MCC Recreation – Provided the following observations:

The starting point for asking for developer contributions is the attached report approved by elected members in February 2015 – based on this the off-site recreation contribution would be £892,620 (285 units x £3,132 per unit) and the off-site play contribution would be £228,000 (285 units x £800 per unit).

To the best of my knowledge the only other strategic development site identified in the LDP that has been granted planning permission pre-CIL is the Wonastow Road development. The off-site recreation contribution from that development (based on the attached formula) is £1,013,000 for 350 houses, and the play provision is in excess of £300,000 - so the above figures for Undy are along the same lines as an already approved application in respect of an LDP strategic site. In that respect a precedent has been set. This formula was also used to determine the off-site contributions for the Kingfisher Rise development in Undy and we have also used the evidence from the open spaces study to ask for contributions from Coed Glas and Mulberry House in Abergavenny in recent months.

I accept that it would be unreasonable to ask for contributions of this magnitude if there was a surplus of off-site recreation and play facilities, but the evidence shows that there is a large shortfall in off-site recreation provision and a shortage of play provision in Magor and Undy. This evidence comes from the Open Spaces Study undertaken on the Council's behalf by Ashley Godfrey Associates specifically to support the LDP. I have again set out in summary form the findings of the open spaces study in relation to Magor with Undy:

Provision	Surplus/Deficiency
Public Open Space	Deficiency of 0.19 hectares
Outdoor Sport	Deficiency of 5.8 hectares

Natural/Semi Natural Greenspace	Surplus of 4.4 hectares
Equipped Play	Deficiency of 1.25 hectares
Informal Open Spaces	Deficiency of 0.80 hectares
Allotments	Deficiency of 1.12 hectares

This information has been available to all departments of the County Council since the study was produced in December 2008 and I would have thought that this would have been taken into consideration when submitting the application for the Rockfield Farm site.

In terms of the legality of asking for contributions, we have always taken the three S106 “tests” into consideration when requesting contributions. I have set out below some comments on each of the three tests:

Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms

It is accepted by the planning authority, based on a study undertaken to help justify the choice of strategic sites for inclusion in the LDP, that there is a significant shortfall in open space provision in Magor with Undy. Translated this means there is a shortfall of 5.8 hectares in terms of outdoor sport and 1.25 hectares for equipped play. The shortfall of 1.12 hectares in allotment provision identified by the consultants back on 2008 can be disregarded, as they failed to take into account the allotment provision on land adjacent to Rockfield Grove, so there is in our view adequate provision for allotments currently in Magor with Undy.

The development of 285 houses on the Rockfield Grove site will increase the population of Magor with Undy by approx. 11.7%, therefore this will significantly exacerbate the pressure placed on the existing open spaces in the local area (identified in the above table), of which there is an evidenced shortfall. It is therefore entirely reasonable for the LPA to ask for a contribution to improve existing outdoor sport and play provision to cope with the increased population produced by the new houses proposed.

Directly related to the development

This is partially covered by the above comments – there is a significant shortfall in existing provision and as a direct result of this development, if it is granted planning permission, the effect of that shortfall will be increased with over 700 new residents that will place still further pressure on an already significant shortfall in off-site provision.

If, as again I think it is reasonable to project, the new development involves an increase in the number of active adults and of children and young people living in the locality, then the existing sport and play facilities should be improved to help deal with this additional pressure. For that reason, I have suggested identifying the sites where the funding requested should be spent and all of these sites are within easy walking/travelling distance of the development site at Rockfield Farm.

You mention the Three Fields Site in your email – I have included this as one of the “beneficiary sites” from the Rockfield Farm site as per my attached email.

Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

As we have identified a shortfall in provision for both adult recreation and play in the local area it seems reasonable that facilities to satisfy any increased demand should be met on the application site – but I doubt that this would be acceptable to the applicant as it would reduce considerably the number of houses proposed – which I note is an increase in the allocation made for this particular site in the adopted LDP. The proposal to direct the recreation and play contributions to improving existing

facilities off-site in the vicinity of the development is therefore both fair and reasonable and in scale with the size of the development proposed.

It may be worth noting as background information that there has been a significant and planned expansion of both Magor and Undy in the years 1974 – 2016 and there has been an acceptance by successive planning authorities that the increase in sport and community facilities has failed to keep pace with the scale of residential developments that have taken place to date. The general feeling is, therefore, that the local population has been “short changed” by this failure on the part of successive planning authorities to ensure there is an adequate supply of community facilities to serve one of the fastest growing centres of population in South East Wales. It therefore seems equitable to request the owners/developers of the Rockfield Farm site to make provision for increases in off-site recreation and play facilities in line with the Council’s accepted policy.

My earlier email suggested a compromise in the amounts to be requested as part of this development and I’m sure that this will be accepted by the two local members concerned but any further reduction in the amounts proposed will I am sure be resisted both by members and by the local Community Council.

In summary, therefore, my suggestion is that the following requirements should be built into the S106 heads of agreement if the LPA proposes to approve the submitted application:

Category	Type	Sub Total	Total
Equipped Play Provision	On site provision	75,000	
	Off-site contribution	100,00	175,000
Adult Recreation Provision	All off-site contributions		850,000

MCC Transport Planning & Policy – Provided the following observations:

Overall the site offers the opportunity to achieve modal shift from single occupancy car use through measures to improve accessibility by sustainable travel means.

Public Transport

As it stands the development is not served well by public transport. As set out in the Transport Assessment there is no rail service in walking distance and the cycle route to the nearest rail station is not good. The main local bus service is only hourly with no evening service, with parts of the development well above 400m walking distance from the nearest bus stop.

Better access to the rail system is required to enable sustainable access to the key regional job markets of Cardiff and Bristol. As noted in the transport assessment the proposed new station for Magor & Undy could provide this. The cost of delivering the new station is currently estimated at £7m, and as the new development would contain about 10% of the future Magor-Undy population, a section 106 contribution of up to £700k towards the cost of progressing the section to delivery would be reasonable.

In terms of bus services, the existing bus service is too far from the parts of the development, and would not be seen as attractive. The development should be designed to enable a through bus service to operate, connecting the new development with Rogiet and Caldicot in the east and through the adjoining Vinegar Hill development and along Dancing Hill with Magor town centre and Newport in the west. The masterplan should indicate the proposed routeing for a bus service plus location of bus stops to minimise walking distance to stops and maximise accessibility. An hourly

Mon-Sat daytime service is estimated to require about £70,000 revenue per annum, as there are two planned new developments that would be served by the service a contribution of up to £175,000 over 5 years to develop the route and build patronage would be reasonable.

Active Travel

The transport Assessment makes reference to design to current standards and proposed walking and cycling measures. Clarification is needed whether this means the design is in line with the Active Travel Act Design Guidance. The Design and Access Statement specifically refers to the Manual For Street, the Active Travel Act Design Guidance clarifies that while local authorities may also consider such guidance, advice contained within the Active Travel Act Design Guidance takes precedence.

It is good to see the Transport Assessment reviewing the Existing Routes Maps (now accepted by Welsh Government), though as shown there is little in Magor & Undy that passed the audit. It would be useful if the Transport Assessment could also show the routes used for measuring distance to local amenities (paragraph 3.8) and to ascertain where those routes fell short of the standard set out in the Active Travel Act Design Guidance (i.e. undertake audits). The work previously undertaken by MCC may be helpful in this and can be made available.

The Transport Assessment already identifies the lack of path along the B4245 between Undy and Rogiet as a key issue. I would expect there to be further (much smaller) issues between the development site and some of the other named facilities. The development should provide an appropriate section 106 contribution towards bringing the routes up to standard. While it is difficult to put a cost on this, it should not cost more than £100k. The cost of the Magor/Undy-Rogiet footpath is estimated at £350k, as this will be mostly used by residents closer to the Rogiet-end of the Magor/Undy,, a contribution of £70k would be reasonable.

The development should also include direct, high-quality walking/cycling link to Rockfield View and Old Stone Lane.

MCC Education – Provided the following observations:

Our processes would indicate that the 270 dwellings at Rockfield Farm could generate 59 pupils. Within the catchment area we also have Vinegar Hill development (225 dwellings) which we would anticipate could generate 49 pupils. So the potential for 108 pupils from both developments.

Undy Primary is currently working on a capacity for 359 pupils, and there are currently 278 children on roll. This capacity is calculated on the basis of the 12 classrooms / teaching spaces currently being used by the school.

However, Undy Primary does have a potential capacity for 420 pupils through an addition two demountable that are on site. These demountables are not currently being used by the school for teaching purposes – I believe one is being used by a play group (private setting) and the other is a music room. I'm not sure what the suitability of these rooms are if they were to be reinstated as classrooms – Simon / Richard, have you had the opportunity to look at this?

With the Rockfield Farm and the Vinegar Hill Developments, we anticipate that the School could reach 414 on roll by 2021 so the 2 demountables would need to be brought back in as classrooms. As previously mentioned, Simon and Richard lead on

the S106 contributions for CYP so they will need to advise, but my thoughts would be that claiming s106 would be dependent on the suitability of these demountable spaces.

In terms of the query from Councillor Taylor, yes we would need to consider Magor Primary School which does have capacity to accommodate additional children – they have approximately 295 pupils on roll and a capacity for 388 pupils. The two developments appear to be within a reasonable distance to Magor School, although we would need to respect that it is a Church In Wales School and not all parents would wish for their children to be educated through these means. Magor would however be able to accommodate some of the additional children generated from the developments if needed.

MCC Highways – Have no objections subject to condition, providing the following observations:

Transport Assessment – Traffic Impact

The Transport Assessment submitted in support of the application has been the subject of detailed discussion with the applicant and the applicant's consultant to ensure that the impact of the proposed development is suitably assessed. As requested the transport assessment has considered the impact on the local network (B4245 and local junctions) on the basis of with or without the M4 Corridor around Newport, the historically protected Undy / Magor By-Pass (Policy MV10) and the requirement to provide an east -west link to the adjacent Vinegar Hill Site (Policy SAH6).

The transport assessment has specifically modelled and tested a number of development scenarios and the outcome is that whatever scenario is taken forward then the impact on the local highway network (B4245) and key junctions is minimal and the development can be accessed via either a priority T junction on the B4245 as detailed on Drawing No. 7008501/101 General Arrangement.

I therefore offer no objections to the proposal from a traffic impact perspective subject to suitable conditions imposed to control the design and construction of the means of access.

Transport Assessment – Connectivity / Permeability

The transport assessment has been developed to take account of the need to provide connectivity between the application site, the adjacent LDP allocation at Vinegar Hill (Policy SAH6) and the B4245, the transport assessment and development master plan indicates the proposal and has demonstrated that the provision can be adopted and implemented enabling transport permeation.

The provision of the east to west link between the developments will therefore need to be further considered and controlled during the implementation and delivery of the allocated LDP development allocations.

Means of Access – B4245

The proposed means of access as assessed and as detailed on Drawing No. 7008501/101 General Arrangement, Appendix H Transport Assessment is acceptable in principle, however the means of access will be subject to detail design, safety audit and technical audit / review and will be required to be constructed prior to the commencement of the development due to the strategic nature of the B4245. The proposed junction will be required to be carried out subject to a S106 agreement and the applicant / land owner entering into Section 278 Agreement, Highways Act 1980

with the Council as Highway Authority. It is essential therefore that appropriate conditions are sought to secure this requirement.

Parking Provision

It is noted that the applicant has evaluated the parking provision in accordance with the Monmouthshire Parking Standards and will provide one parking space per bedroom up to a maximum of three spaces for residents.

Sustainable Transport

Walking / Cycling

The transport assessment has considered the walking & cycling requirements and it is recognised that the development and the master plan will be developed further to provide facilities and accessible links to promote walking and cycling. It is also recognised that pedestrian facilities beyond the proposed development in particularly along the B4245 towards Rogiet / Caldicot are lacking and identifies that improvements are required to provide sustainable linkages between Magor/Undy and Rogiet/Caldicot.

Public Transport

It is recognised that the development has bus services and bus stops are available on the B4245 within 200 metres. It is essential and will be a requirement that the development be served by a local bus service and the internal highway network and link to the adjacent LDP allocated site known as Vinegar Hill (Policy SAH6) should be designed to accommodate this requirement.

It is recommended that the Councils Transport Planning and Policy Manager is consulted to offer further advice and comment.

Personal Injury Collision Data

The personal injury collision data has been reviewed with no recorded accidents and collisions occurring in the immediate vicinity of the proposed means of access the review also has identified that there is an existing road safety concern on the B4245.

Internal Layout

The submission of the Master Plan Report and Access Statement dated July 2016 and Drawing Nos. 02 Development Framework & 03 Indicative Master Plan clearly demonstrates that the design principles being adopted will create an environment that will be safe and suitable for all, namely;

Main access route passes through the site from the B4245 to connect with Vinegar Hill strategic development site (policy SAH6)

Primary Roads and Local Street

Pedestrian Priority Streets

Key Pedestrian / Cycle Links

Re-aligned Public Rights of Way

Parking in accordance with the councils adopted Parking Standards

The Elms, an existing unclassified lane, will be required to be re-engineered and traffic orders implemented to create a safe and manageable link for both walking and cycling between the proposed development and the existing Rockfield Grove development but at the same time restricting vehicle movement. It will also be a requirement that Elm Road is retained and improved where it form an integral part of the estate road layout providing access to the residential development and maintaining access to existing

properties and communities to the North of the M4. The requirements to facilitate this requirement will be subject to further detailed negotiation and agreement and will be subject to the owner entering into a Section 106 and subsequent S278 Agreement, Highways Act 1980 with the Council as Highway Authority to carry out the necessary highway improvements. It is essential therefore that appropriate conditions are sought to secure this requirement.

Construction Plan & Construction Traffic Management Plan

It is inevitable that a development of this scale will during the establishment and construction phases create some inconvenience and disruption to existing residents and road users. It is therefore necessary for the applicant and subsequent developers to consider the impact of the development and submit their proposals to reduce the impact of the construction activities on the local environment and community.

Surface Water Management

Monmouthshire County Council are the Lead local Flood Authority for the proposed development. It is noted that a Drainage Strategy July 2016 has been submitted in support of the application.

Although the proposal and the strategy is still at the preliminary stage, generally, I would agree with the strategy for the management of surface water on the site due to the varying ground conditions, topography and lack of existing surface water features (drainage ditches /watercourses). The use of different methods of controlling surface water on a site location basis, the use of pot soakaways, permeable surfaced private drives & car parks, swales etc is duly noted and welcomed and is generally in accordance with the Recommended non statutory standards for sustainable drainage (SUDS) in Wales – designing, constructing, operating and maintaining surface water drainage systems, January 2016.

At this time, the preferred option to manage the majority of the site surface water run-off is to attenuate and discharge at the pro rata Q_{bar} rate, however whether a suitable means of discharge is readily available at this time is still to be determined it is therefore necessary for the applicant to carry out further detailed analysis and investigation to identify and substantiate an appropriate point of discharge to the local drainage land drainage network, Pratt Reen.

The Recommended non statutory standards for sustainable drainage (SUDS) in Wales – designing, constructing, operating and maintaining surface water drainage systems, January 2016 state it is vital that adoption and management arrangements for SUDS infrastructure and all drainage elements are agreed with the local authority (LLFA) or sewerage undertaking at the planning stage.

Generally it should also be noted the surface water management strategy has not identified whether the surface water sewers will be for adoption by Dwr Cymru / Welsh Water, generally for surface water sewers to be considered for adoption the adoption is reliant upon the receiving attenuation/ storage ponds being adopted and maintained by the Council for perpetuity and the applicant will be required to dedicate the land and provide a commuted sums to manage and maintain the ponds.

It is recommended than any planning decision is subject to appropriate conditions to ensure that the development does not commence until the strategy has been developed and approved and the status of the on-site sustainable drainage systems and surface water sewers has been agreed.

MCC Green Infrastructure (GI) Team – Provided the following observations:

The proposal submitted and the LVIA and DAS represents a positive development to the integration of GI in this project and the GI team welcome the principals identified however we feel that this hasn't gone far enough and the following issues need to be addressed;

As stated in the Landscape response the Indicative Masterplan and the Development Framework should be brought together in 2 plans retitled GI Masterplan and GI development framework.

The GI Masterplan should include;

- Only entrance and exits – all internal roads (excluding elms lane) to be removed.
- Footpaths and cycle routes included.
- Green corridors including accessible green corridors identified.
- Landscape/GI infrastructure to be defined– confirmation all fall outside of private ownership.

The GI development Framework should include;

- Development zones
- Design goals to be included for each of the zones this should include maximum heights of development and massing and scale of development together with good quality urban design principals relating to the public realm and quality of the units in the different zones. Action Points 1-6 of the Landscape response will be relevant to this as well.
- Phasing of development and how this relates to the GI infrastructure e.g planting buffers, avenues of trees, green corridors footpath access, informal play areas, woodland, suds and open space areas. There will need to be a clear strategy for implementation to ensure that appropriate mitigation and GI infrastructure is provided for new residents if certain parts do not come forward the site.
- Management of all these areas needs to be clearly set out and defined in relation to the phasing of the areas, the principals of which will need to be established at outline to enable the detailed delivery of the GI management Plan at reserved matters.

The site has a number of Key assets which need to be embraced further of particular significance is ;

1 Breezy Bank SINC which will provide an important resource for the new residents and a unique selling point for developers. A balance will need to be established between public access and use of the woodland by biodiversity and therefore key areas of access and less disturbed areas will need to be considered along with site interpretation and a management plan the latter is something which needs to be considered for the whole site.

2 & 3 Greater accessibility throughout the site in the form of accessible green corridors which connects with Breezy bank Woodland the Suds, the adjacent allotments and a route through to formal and informal play areas.

4 Public access throughout the site should embrace where appropriate and achievable, cycle routes together with formalising access to assets such as the allotments, existing adjacent residential communities and the option where negotiations allow to the field to the west of Zone D should the new M4 proposal come forward.

5 Formal and informal play should be better integrated – the GI Masterplan should clearly identify where the formal play area is to be established and then the role of

informal play areas and how they are accessed and can be used should be set out in the design goals for each of the development zones.

Note :In order for the following condition to be able to be properly implements the Landscape and GI infrastructure and phasing needs to be clearly defined and agreed.

MCC Biodiversity – Provided the following observations:

The application for the proposal is informed by ecological assessments:

Rockfield Farm, Undy, Monmouthshire An Ecological Survey Report by Just Mammals Consultancy LLP on behalf of Monmouthshire County Council dated February 2016

Rockfield Farm, Undy, Monmouthshire An extended Phase 1 habitat and species assessment and bat and bird survey by Just Mammals Consultancy LLP on behalf of Monmouthshire County Council dated August 2014

Rockfield Farm, Undy, Monmouthshire A report following a survey for dormouse presence by Just Mammals Consultancy LLP on behalf of Monmouthshire County Council dated January 2015

The surveys and assessments provide enough information, at this time, to make a sound planning decision.

The application is Outline in detail but provides a Development Framework and Masterplan to identify the delivery expected for green infrastructure including things such as habitat to be retained, buffer strips and new habitat. We need to be satisfied that this will be delivered be securing these elements of the framework.

Priority Habitats

Breezy Bank SINC is situated at the site LDP policy NE1 is therefore relevant and must be addressed. This will need to be safeguard and protected during the development process and carefully managed to ensure that its integral value is not degraded with increased public use in the future. The ecological buffer is welcomed and must fall outside of private ownership and be included in a Green Infrastructure Management Plan for the site. A construction environment management plan (CEMP) will be recommended as a means to safeguard this and other biodiversity during development.

The hedgerows are also considered to be priority habitat that will provide connectivity value at the site. These vary in quality and inevitably will be degraded as the result of the development, however, many will be retained and additional planting is indicatively shown. Retained habitats will need to be protected during development and this together with new planting should fall outside private ownership in the future.

Bat assessment of the existing buildings was undertaken in 2014. From the description, most of the buildings are unsuitable as bat roosts. However, should substantial time passes prior to the commencement of works, the buildings should be resurveyed and it is recommended that a planning condition is used to secure this.

Bats foraging at the site include the priority species; noctule, common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle. The amount of habitat available to them should not decrease and new habitat opportunities e.g. associated with the SUDS should be beneficial. Whilst these species are not known to be particularly sensitive to lighting whilst foraging, lighting changes the behaviour of these species making them more vulnerable to

predators such as owls. Lighting should therefore be designed to reduce light spill with particular consideration for wildlife including bats. A planning condition shall be used to secure this submission with Reserved Matters applications.

Nesting birds

The tawny owl site should be reassessed prior to submission of the reserved matters relevant to this part of the site to identify the extent of use and to inform mitigation proposals. The location of boxes for this and other nesting bird compensation should be included in the submission(s). A planning condition will be needed to secure this.

Badger

Badgers are a protected species and a detailed assessment has been undertaken. A construction environment management plan condition will be recommended and a detailed method statement for badger shall be a requirement of this.

MCC Landscape – Provided the following comments:

The site is situated on the edge of Undy located on rising land known locally as Vinegar Hill overlooking open countryside. It is bounded to the east by green wedge and overlooks the Gwent Levels a landscape of outstanding historic interest to the south and beyond to the Severn Estuary. It is identified by LANDMAP as being of high value for part of its historical and geological aspects and moderate value for its visual and sensory and landscape habitats and of low value for its cultural aspect area. The Monmouthshire Landscape sensitivity and capacity study has identified the site (a proposed candidate site CS/0249) as of high/ medium sensitivity with the part of the site in which the development sits being of medium sensitivity due to the degraded urban fringe character. The housing capacity has been identified as of medium capacity and development acceptable so long as a suitable buffer was maintained with the M4 and development was avoided on the skyline.

The proposal impacts upon the following LDP Development Policies ;

LC5 Protection and Enhancement of landscape character

LC6 Green Wedge

GI 1 Green Infrastructure

DES 1 General Design considerations

DES 2 Amenity Open Space

CRF2 in relation to the provision of outdoor recreation and allotments.

The LDPs Inspectors report has identified that ;

“Whilst the allocations indicate that the principle of residential use site is acceptable, in sensitive landscapes proposals would be subject to Policy LC5. A landscape assessment would be required and the detailed proposal only permitted if it did not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the special character of the landscape. Policy DES1, which sets out general design considerations for all development, would also apply; it includes the need for landscaping which takes account of the appearance of the existing landscape and its intrinsic character.”

Of the documents submitted in support of the application I make the following comments;

In terms of Green Infrastructure I feel this could have been explored further – no GI assets and/or opportunities plan has been submitted in either the DAS or the LVIA. Nevertheless the GI principals are positive and these are supported however they do

not come across strongly in the Indicative Masterplan and Development Framework. I have considered the scheme and the following comments in combination with the separate GI response considers how GI may be better integrated.

The LVIA which includes a cumulative visual impact assessment and supporting viewpoint analysis and photomontages is a comprehensive assessment and I welcome such a thorough approach. The findings in the LLCA assessment have helpfully highlighted sensitive issues in terms of change of character, visual and cumulative impact which have helped inform the following observations and recommendations for action ;

General

The Indicative Masterplan and the Development Framework should be brought together in two plans . All roads and housing layouts to be removed only entrance and exits, development zones, footpaths and cycle routes and the landscape infrastructure to be included. Design goals to be included for each of the zones. Details of these requirements are set out in the GI response.

1 Elms Lane in the LVIA has been identified as being susceptible to significant change due to the desire to introduce new vehicular access points; this in combination with the cumulative impact of the proposed development and the M4 proposal will lead to a substantial adverse effect on the character of the road. In addition the assessment of visual impact has clearly identified the road as a sensitive location where its rural character is important and helps set the context for wider views towards the Gwent levels and the Severn Estuary beyond it.

Action 1

The character of this lane as a rural narrow road bounded on either side by hedges should be retained, development set back and additional tree planting introduced to help offset the cumulative impact of the M4 as highlighted in the LVIA. The current lane has no footways unlike the development framework which indicates this as something to be included on both sides of the road. To avoid this urbanisation it is recommended that pedestrian access should be limited to one side and set behind the existing hedgerow on the development side and the lane retained at its existing width. This should be included in the GI masterplan.

2 LLCA 3 Breezy bank to Rockfield Farm SINC – it is positive that this wooded green space is being retained however the proposal will be isolated from much of the development other than access along the road, it has limited connectivity with the rest of the site or with the community beyond the development and no accessibility through the woodland.

Action 2

This wooded green space needs to have stronger green corridor connections some of which should be accessible throughout the development and beyond to the wider community. In addition there could be accessible routes through the woodland as part of the wider scheme and opportunities of educational outdoor learning could be tied in with the local schools. This should be included in the GI masterplan.

3 C1 & C2 (Development framework) LLCA 4 Rolling Farmland (the elms to vinegar hill).

It has been acknowledged that this development would result in a substantial adverse effect due to its elevation and the proposed nature of the development as an area for

employment. Whilst the retention of the hedgerows and trees is positive and the landscape buffer is helpful it is unclear what the depth of the buffer is and there is no clear green corridor connecting the SuD. In addition there is a need to understand more clearly and define the heights of potential units so that they are contained in views and vistas from the motorway to prevent the effect of ribbon development. In addition care will need to be taken regarding the interface with the adjacent Bovis site – the current proposal indicates a line of hedge planting which is insufficient particularly on its western and southern boundaries.

The LVIA has highlighted that development C1 and C2 will result in a substantial cumulative impact in combination with the proposed Vinegar hill development and M4. This assessment is reinforced in viewpoint 9 of the photomontages.

Action 3

Strengthen the Landscape buffer down to the motorway and along the boundary with the adjacent proposed Bovis site (on its western, southern and eastern boundaries) this buffer needs to have indicative minimum and maximum widths (this will also help mitigate the cumulative impacts of the development. An accessible green corridor to be incorporated connecting the SuD to the surrounding green space not just a hedge line. The Landscape buffer along C1, C2 and D needs to be defined on all plans – it has not been incorporated into the Development framework.

To address issues of cumulative impact the scale, height and elevation of the employment units be varied – height will need to be agreed as part of the design principals. This will help break up solid lines and reduce the effect of ribbon development something always strongly resisted in Monmouthshire along the M4 corridor being a gateway and the entrance to Wales.

4 A,B and D (Development Framework) LLCA 5 Rolling Farmland including Amenity Open Space.

I consider the change from agricultural fields to urban development will have a substantial adverse effect on the Landscape character in this case and its edge of settlement location makes it all the more sensitive to change. I am concerned that the pocket open spaces do not adequately address the provision of onsite open space requirement. The current AOS forms a green buffer all along the Undy to Magor settlement edge and whilst it is acknowledged that the AOS land is privately owned and therefore the benefits have been limited, the retention of a green corridor here as part of the development offers an opportunity to provide more access to connected green space on site and importantly permeability between the estates. It is further considered that policy CRF2 in relation to the provision of outdoor recreation and allotments has not been properly addressed within the development. An appropriate green infrastructure framework which incorporates suitable AOS is therefore essential.

The photomontages have been very helpful in understanding the potential impacts and it is particularly useful when considering viewpoint 9 which clearly emphasise the height of the land in area B and the dominance of area C and D. It is clear that development in area B will be particularly prominent even if the new M4 were to take place, this in combination with the existing development will have a detrimental cumulative impact consolidating development.

Action 4

In fulfilling Policy GI1 further information is requested in considering the provision of allotments, outdoor recreation in particular sports grounds and play facilities and their accessibility in relation to the proposed development. (see the GI response separately

). In the interests of fulfilling Policy LC5 and G11 I would strongly recommend reinstating part of the Amenity Open Space in the form of a green corridor with pocket open areas(which could provide informal play areas), running parallel to the existing settlement to ensure access to the Breezy Bank woodland and the SuD in the southern section of the site as well as a route to the allotments. By incorporating an accessible green corridor this will have the effect of mitigating the cumulative effect of the two developments and offer a green lung allowing the two developments to interact and access green space; something which the current proposal is not offering.

In addition areas A, B and D form the bulk of the residential development there needs to be a filtering of density towards the settlement edge and greater recognition of the opportunity for key views and vistas towards GI assets/features and landmark features (both internal and external) for residents eg vistas looking west to the Breezy Bank woodland, vistas looking east to the Gwent levels (ref Viewpoint 1, 2 of the LVIA). This will require careful design layout and inclusion of features such as avenues of tree to help frame vistas internally and externally. This will require revision of the Masterplan to take account of these changes and to also remove the indicative layout – replaced instead with design goals for each of the areas identified.

Area B needs to be restricted to a maximum of 2 storey development to limit the visual impact and there is a need to introduced tree planting to help break up the cumulative impact which can also help provide legibility and define landmark features.

Area D whilst lower needs to ensure that units have visual diversity in heights and elevations to avoid solid blocks of development.

5 Protective Future development area

This area was identified in the safeguarding zone for the M4 – the area will be exposed and proposed developed have a significant landscape and visual impact regardless of what development takes places if any in this area.

Action 5

The Landscape buffer needs to be defined in terms of minimum and maximum widths. A 10 m buffer is suggested – this could be an accessible green corridor. Principals of development should be set out as part of the design goals for each of the zones and included in the GI masterplan.

6 Proposed Road Layout

I am concerned that the design has already been driven by a road layout despite this being an outline application.

Action 6

All road layouts to be removed and only entrance exits and the existing elms lane to be included in the overall GI masterplan.

To be able to fully support this proposal which I believe could offer many benefits I require the above actions to be addressed -

- General points.
- Action points 1-6.

MCC Tree Officer – Provided the following observations:

In the event of the development being approved the following condition is to be used.

Condition

No trees or shrubs are to be removed until there has been submitted and agreed in writing a scheme of tree protection in accordance with information shown in the Pre-development Tree Survey dated March 2016. The information shall contain the following:

- A tree retention and removal plan.
- A scaled tree protection plan showing retained trees and their root protection areas on the proposed layout.
- An Arboricultural Method Statement showing how trees/shrubs may be protected from harm where construction activity within any root protection area is unavoidable.
- A scheme of access facilitation pruning.
- Tree protection barrier details.
- A scheme of Arboricultural monitoring over the course of the development.

Reason

To ensure the long term health and viability of valuable green infrastructure assets in accordance with Policy S13 – Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment.

MCC Right of Way Officer – Provided the following observations:

The applicant's attention should be drawn to Public Footpaths 17, 22, 23, 24 and Restricted Byway 30 which either run adjacent to or through the site of the proposed development. The applicant recognises that paths need to be realigned to accommodate the development but they also need to apply for a Town & County Planning Act path order to achieve this. Importantly path orders are not guaranteed to be successful.

The Active Travel Bill (Wales) requires local authorities to continuously improve facilities and routes for pedestrians and cyclists and to consider their needs at design stage. In order to better to comply with this requirement, MCC would like the following and details of how they can be achieved to form part of the application.

All of the pedestrian paths/links including the public rights of way upgraded to dual purpose footway/cycleways.

A walkway/cycleway introduced to run alongside the B4225 from the end of Rockfield Grove to at least as far as the allotments and Footpath 24.

A walkway/cycleway introduced to run alongside the balance of the Elms to connect to Restricted Byway no. 30 on the northern side of the M48.

The land to the west of the proposed development is an allocated development site so in addition to upgrading the existing public footpaths to dual status the applicant should look at additional ways of strengthening links to this land.

The development should also incorporate links to the potential future development area indicated on the Development Framework plan. The link to the land to the east of zone D (development framework plan) is a welcome although I understand that permission for the public to access this land is not within the control applicant and may not be forthcoming. Every effort should be made to secure this authorisation. An entrance to the northern end of the allotments might be welcomed by future residents.

All of the paths/cycleways and Green Infrastructure assets need to be protected for use by the public and residents. Details of how this is to be achieved should also form part of the application. If they are not to be adopted by MCC and maintained by

contribution, access and maintenance should form part of a Local Government Act agreement.

Countryside Access notes and welcomes the planting/green buffer alongside the rerouted public footpaths indicated on the Indicative master plan. This information should however form part of the Development framework plan and a concrete part of the application.

MCC Specialist Environmental Health – Provide the following observations:

A total of four soil samples were taken for chemical/contamination analysis across the 11 hectare site. All samples were from the undeveloped part of the site and are mainly fields. Laboratory analysis did not identify any contaminants of concern above the chosen generic assessment criteria's, for a residential end use, within the four samples taken. The higher risk (with regard to potential harm to human health from ground contamination) area of the site was not sampled due to the presence of farm buildings. This area (towards the centre of the sit) was is also the former location of an old quarry that has been filled in with unknown material and a limekiln.

Further site investigation will be required inside the developed/quarry/limekiln area. In addition, when plot layouts are known, further sampling should be undertaken across the site within areas that will be allocated as soft landscaped areas and gardens. It is possible that remediation will be required following this investigation, therefore I would recommend that you contact Environmental Health for advice and conditions with regard to land contamination, when a firmer plan for the site has been developed.

The air quality assessment undertaken by WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff (Final Version 2/ July 2016), used modelling to determine that the 226 property residential development and 5575m² employment (B1) use, would not create any exceedances of the nitrogen dioxide air quality objective at existing or future receptors for the operational phase. This was found to be the case irrespective on if the M4 relief road was built or not. The modelling did identify that the construction phase did have the potential to effect ambient air quality, and therefore a robust management plan will have to be implemented. The air quality assessment is based on the predicted traffic generation from the site.

MCC Environmental Health – Provided the following observations:

I note that the proposed development includes proposals for both Residential and Employment (B1) uses. I have no objections to the proposed Employment (B1) development at this stage. Whilst I do not anticipate significant reservations, any comments from this department will be reserved for subsequent planning applications. With reference to the proposed residential development I note that areas are within NEC C for both scenarios, where the M4 is as per the existing situation, and also its potential development, with significantly more residential properties entering NEC C in the event of the M4 development.

TAN 11 {Technical Advice Note (Wales) 11} provides that planning permission should not normally be granted if a residential development falls within Category C. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example, because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise.

The Noise Assessment Addendum, Report No. 70018501-001-02 provides modelling based around the establishment of a noise barrier but I understand that a noise barrier is not acceptable by the Local Planning Authority.

Where a TAN 11 assessment shows that properties fall into Category B as is the case in some areas of this residential development generally the submission of a noise mitigation scheme can be dealt with as a planning condition. However as there are significant areas proposed which fall into Category C I feel that the noise matter should be addressed and an acceptable scheme submitted in order that an informed decision can be made at outline planning stage.

I therefore recommend that planning permission should not be granted unless it can be effectively demonstrated that the following internal/external noise levels can be met, which are based on guidance given in BS 8233:2014: Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings:

Road Traffic Noise – Internal

All habitable rooms exposed to external road traffic noise in excess of 55 dBA Leq 16 hour [free field] during the day [07.00 to 23.00 hours] or 45 dBA Leq 8 hour [free field] at night [23.00 to 07.00 hours] shall be subject to sound insulation measures to ensure that all such rooms achieve an internal noise level of 35 dBA Leq 16 hour during the day and 30 dBA Leq 8 hour at night. The submitted scheme shall ensure that habitable rooms subject to sound insulation measures shall be able to be effectively ventilated without opening windows.

Road Traffic Noise – External

The maximum day time noise level in outdoor living areas exposed to external road traffic noise shall not exceed 50 dBA Leq 16 hour [free field]. The upper guideline value of 55 dB LAeq,T may be accepted where it can be satisfactorily justified.

I note that the modelling in the noise assessment is based on road traffic data for the design year 2026. To assist with the appraisal of the proposal I would recommend that an explanation was included in the report as to why 2026 data is being used.

The report does not include any assessment of individual noise events.

TAN 11 States:

"Night-time noise levels (23.000 - 07.00): sites where individual noise events regularly exceed 82 dB

L_{Amax} (S time weighting) several times in any hour should be treated as being in NEC C, regardless of the LAeq,8h (except where the LAeq,8h already puts the site in NEC D)."

In order to ensure the appropriate TAN 11 - Category is established I would also recommend that individual noise events data was included in the noise assessment.

Welsh Government (Transport) – Provided the following observations:

Would offer no objections to the development although to maintain the safety and free flow of the M4 motorway, directs the following notes to be applied to any consent your Authority may grant;

1. There shall be no direct access of any kind to the motorway.
2. No works shall be undertaken which could in any way effect the structural integrity of the motorway asset without further consultation.
3. There shall be no interference with the trunk road highway boundary fence or existing trunk road soft estate.
4. No drainage from the development site shall be connected to or allowed to discharge into the trunk road drainage system.
5. Any noise mitigation such as a barrier etc. required at the development site, is a matter for the developer in terms of both consideration and provision.

Wales & West Utilities – Provided the following comments:

According to our records to our records this is no apparatus in the area. However, gas pipes owned by other GT's and also privately owned may be present in this area. Information with regard to such pipes should be obtained from the owners.

Safe digging practices, in accordance with HS(G)47, must be used to verify and establish the actual position of mains, pipes, services and other apparatus on site before any mechanical plant is used. It is your responsibility to ensure that this information is provided to all persons (either direct labour or contractors) working for you on or near gas apparatus.

Welsh Water – Provided the following observations:

We would request that if you are minded to grant Planning Consent for the development that the conditions and advisory notes provided are included within the consent to ensure no detriment to existing residents or the environment and to Dwr Cymru Welsh Water's assets.

We have reviewed the information submitted as part of this application with particular focus on the Drainage Strategy dated July 2016 which shows surface water drainage via sustainable infiltration methods. With regards to foul flows, a Hydraulic Modelling Assessment was undertaken on the public sewerage network to assess the ability of the network to accommodate the flows generated from the propose development. Likewise a similar model was undertaken for the potable water supply.

A number of solutions have been identified for both foul and potable water and a copy of the foul drainage report is included within the Drainage Strategy. Once a preferred developer is on board we advise that they contact us at the earliest possible stage to progress with relevant solutions. The agreed solution shall then be constructed and delivered in full prior to any properties connecting to the public sewer. We therefore recommend that if you are minded to grant planning permission that the requested conditions and advisory notes are included within any subsequent approval notice.

Cadw – Provided the following observations:

The propose development is located within the vicinity of the scheduled monuments known as Standing Stone 252m South of Bencroft Lane (MM068) and Medieval Moated Site 400m Nof Undy Church (MM198).

The application area is located some 15m north of scheduled monument Medieval Moated Site 400m N of Undy Church (MM198). This monument comprises the remains of a well-preserved medieval moated homestead. It consists of a rectangular enclosure measuring 20m by 30m surrounded by a ditch and a counterscarp bank. A ditch extends northwest from the northern corner of the site towards the modern road.

The moated site is located at the end of a stream that feeds into the modern Collister Reen. The significant views from the moated site would have been to the east and west (along the modern B4245) and to the south (along modern Church Road). The significant view to the northwest (along the modern The Elms) would have been limited due to the topography.

The application area is to the north. As noted above this is not in an identified significant view and from most of the moated site the view north is now blocked by the modern houses of Pembroke Close. However, there will be views to the application area from the eastern part of the scheduled area and from its north western extension, which as noted above formed part of a later annex to the main moated site. The land

which will be visible from the scheduled area formed part of its agricultural holding, as demonstrated by the lidar and geophysical results identifying medieval ridge and furrow and later strip enclosures in this area. The proposed development will therefore have an impact on the setting of scheduled ancient monument MM198 as it will be constructed over the agricultural land associated with the moated site which is an important aspect of its relationship with the adjacent landscape. However, there has been considerable change to the landscape surrounding the scheduled monument, especially in the last thirty years. The development of Pembroke Close, along with the earlier construction of the houses on the eastern side of Church Road and the additional developments on Little Hill have urbanised the area to the north and west of the moated site, and the presence of the railway and attenuation pond to the south has also blocked the links to the Caldicot Level. As such the proposed development will continue the process of change to the setting of the monument but, given the alterations that have already occurred it is our opinion that the impact of the proposed development on the setting of MM198 will be slight adverse.

The application area is located some 535m to the west of Standing Stone 252m South of Bencroft Lane (MM068). The monument comprises the remains of a standing stone, which probably dates to the Bronze Age (c. 2300 – 800 BC). Standing stones are thought to have been located in positions where they could be seen from, and allow views to, contemporary settlements, other ritual monuments and natural features. In this case, given the surrounding topography, it is thought that any associated ritual sites would have been to the north and any settlement sites to the south along the “fen edge” where the alluvium of the Caldicot Level meets the solid geology. However, so far no definite sites have been located. Modern changes to the landscape, most notably the construction of the M4 have had a significant impact on the setting of this standing stone, and the route of the proposed motorway to the south of Newport will also have a significant impact.

The proposed development will be visible from the scheduled monument but will be partly screened by existing vegetation. It will bring development closer to the scheduled monument but will be seen as part of the existing settlement of Undy and therefore in our opinion will have a light adverse impact on the setting of scheduled monument MM068.

In conclusion the proposed development will have a slight adverse impact on scheduled monuments MM068 and MM198 and your authority will need to consider these impacts when determining the current application.

Natural Resources Wales – Provided the following observations:

We do not object to the proposed development as submitted. Please be advised that if the proposals/scheme changes we would like to be notified as this may lead to a change in our advice.

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust (GGAT) – Provided the following observations:

We can confirm the proposal has an archaeological constraint. As you are aware, an archaeological field evaluation has been conducted on the site by Headland Archaeology (Report no. 1209, dated January 2017). Whilst the majority of the trenches encountered no archaeologically significant remains, the evaluation in Field 5 recovered material of prehistoric date from within the fabric of a system of limestone rubble banks. The earthworks form an irregular enclosure with a possibly associated field system; evidence was found for shallow ditches associated with up-cast banks

Whilst the site may not necessarily be of national importance, it is certainly of regional importance and very likely to be adversely affected by the proposed development. Therefore it is our recommendation that a condition requiring the applicant to submit a detailed written scheme of investigation for a programme of archaeological to protect the archaeological resource should be attached to any consent granted by your Members.

We envisage that, based on the results of the archaeological field evaluation, this programme of work would take the form of the full excavation of Field 5, and an archaeological watching brief during the ground works required for the development in the remaining fields. It will contain detailed contingency arrangements including the provision of sufficient time and resources to ensure that any archaeological features or finds that are located are properly investigated and recorded; it should include provision for any sampling that may prove necessary, post-excavation recording and assessment and reporting and possible publication of the results.

To ensure adherence to the recommendations we recommend that the condition should be worded in a manner similar to model condition 24 given in Welsh Government Circular 016/2014.

4.2 Neighbour Notification

53 letters of objection have been received raising the following areas of concern:

- Negative impact on the existing infrastructure in Undy and Magor.
- Provision of school spaces.
- Commuter trains are already at full capacity.
- The scheme could fund the train station in Undy.
- Is a need for traffic calming and speed control measures.
- The new employment land will not provide enough employment for those moving into the area.
- Already existing pressure on local doctors.
- Council needs to consider the whole lifestyle of the community not just housing.
- There are no local shops, parking, library, leisure facilities or other local amenities in Undy other than the already overstretched facilities near Magor square.
- Loss of green space.
- Public transport is poor leading to reliance on cars.
- Local residents enjoy this green space for walking, running and cycling.
- There is no pedestrian walkway between Undy and the station.
- Loss of wildlife habitat.
- Local services cannot cope with extra demand.
- Sewerage system already struggles.
- Additional housing would compromise the village feel of the area.
- Clarification of number of units proposed or mix of accommodation.
- Much about the approval of this development hinges on future events/developments that may never come to fruition such as the junction for the M48 at Rogiet, the new M4 development and Magor and Undy station.
- No details are shown on the drawing and the M4 relief road has not been decided.
- The Elms to Rockfield Grove should be permanently closed off to motor vehicles, as a pre-commencement condition.
- Will an area be safeguarded to build the bypass in case it is needed?

- Without the bypass how is development traffic going to access the site?
- Will the Rogiet interchange still go ahead even if the M4 relief road doesn't?
- Without the bypass all traffic will still have to use part of the B4245 to access the M4 (even if the relief road and Rogiet interchange are built), joining either via Dancing Hill or the new proposed T junction.
- What are the plans to prevent both development and residential / employment traffic using Vinegar Hill as a rat run?
- Will there be a Welsh residency requirement so that the housing actually helps to solve Welsh housing needs and not the Bristol overspill needs?
- Can MCC confirm that the 2 hectares designated for the class B1 use order will not, in the future end up as additional housing.
- The land is prime agricultural land which due to its character currently provides numerous wildlife habitats which will be lost.
- Has an EIA been undertaken?
- It is essential that the existing public rights of way are maintained in order to facilitate circular walks to the north and south of the M4.
- Have not seen suggestions as to how the associated Section 106 money might be used locally for community projects

5 letters of support have been received highlighting the points:

- We face a national housing shortage and it poses great challenges for people to return to villages such as Undy and Magor to raise their young families.
- Monmouthshire need to make commitments to endorse and fund local amenities.
- Particularly the Railway station that has been required for more than two decades.
- Conditions ought to be placed upon the development to ensure that a minimum of 40% of dwellings should be affordable so that the Council can demonstrate its commitment to ensuring people have affordable places to live in.
- Section 106 money should be allocated to new community facilities.

4.3 Local Member Representations

County Councillor Lisa Dymock – This application was received and registered prior to recent elections. However, Officers have met with Councillor Dymock to brief her on the application.

Former County Councillor Jessica Crook – Has not provided written comments to date.

County Councillor Frances Taylor (adjoining Mill Ward) – Provided the following observations:

This is an outline planning application and therefore detailed designs are not available at this time.

I have some significant concerns regarding certain aspects of the application and request that it is refused in its current form. Alternatively, that it is deferred to allow the matters raised to be dealt with appropriately.

The rationale of developing a mixed use site

The siting of housing and employment land adjacent appears reasonable at face value. However, it seems to be flawed. Magor with Undy have already become something of a dormitory area, owing largely to poor planning decisions by Local Planning Authorities. Magor with Undy lacks investment in community cohesion and facilities and the location

of office space here is unlikely to solve this issue. We have extremely high levels of out commuting to Bristol, Gloucester and further afield. The location of the employment land to the north or the residential site will mean that residents face the prospect of all employment based traffic travelling via their residential streets. This seems contrary to the LDP approach to Place- Making and high levels of residential amenity.

Area of Amenity Importance

The development site contains a significant designated area of amenity importance (as shown in the LDP) and the indicative layout proposes to develop this land. This is unacceptable. There is a significant deficit of open space in Magor with Undy and this further compounds the issue further. There are significant deficits in public open space, outdoor sport ground provision, equipped play areas and informal open spaces.

The SINC / wooded area is not a replacement for the loss off this open space and requires protection in its own right. This is not compatible with LDP policy DES 2.

6.5.5 Green infrastructure, including areas of open space, is important in the built environment as it adds to the character of many settlements and provides social, environmental and economic benefits, as detailed in policies S13 and GI1, including the mitigation of climate change impacts. The primary purpose of this policy is to protect and, where possible, improve the built environment by retaining the overall amenity value of the existing stock of green space. Existing designated areas of amenity open spaces are reaffirmed in the LDP but these will be reviewed as part of a 'Green Infrastructure' Study and associated Supplementary Planning Guidance. Policy GI1 seeks to ensure that development proposals maintain, protect and, where possible, create new green infrastructure and should be considered alongside Policy DES2. Policy DES2 – Areas of Amenity Importance

Development proposals on areas of amenity importance will only be permitted if there is no unacceptable adverse effect on any of the following:

- a) the visual and environmental amenity of the area, including important strategic gaps, vistas, frontages and open spaces;
- b) the relationship of the area of amenity importance to adjacent or linked areas of green infrastructure in terms of its contribution to the character of the locality and / or its ability to relieve the monotony of the built form;
- c) the role of the area as a venue for formal and informal sport, general recreation and as community space, expressed in terms of actual usage and facilities available, as well as its relationship to general open space requirements as set out in policy CRF2;
- d) the cultural amenity of the area, including places and features of archaeological, historic, geological and landscape importance; and
- e) the nature conservation interest of the area, through damage to, or the loss of, important habitats or natural features

It is unacceptable that areas of amenity importance should be lost, particularly as a deficit already exists in Magor with Undy. The land is allocated for amenity in the LDP and the LDP should not be a moveable feast to suit the Authority.

Foul water sewage and drainage

There is currently no capacity within the existing Welsh Water infrastructure to accommodate the new site this is demonstrated in the Welsh Water response and reflected in the Master Planning Brief. The application site should not receive planning permission until there is a clear means of dealing with the capacity issue. If this is to be condition this should be made clear and the terms clarified.

The indicative layout is of concern for the following reasons;

- The mixed use of the site
- It is unclear how the site encourages walking and cycling and public transport
- It is unclear how the site will connect to the wider community.

Section 106 contributions

There are a number of particular circumstances in Magor with Undy which mean that additional pressure on services and facilities which already fall far below required standards for example in play, open space, off site recreation, active travel etc. The LDP clearly reflects the Authorities commitment to address some of these issues in selecting Magor with Undy as a strategic site. I understand that 106 is site specific and that one must satisfy the three tests in order to apply 106 to mitigate impact and alleviate the pressure of a new development.

I am also concerned that we avoid any conflict between the Authority as Landowner, wishing to achieve the maximum capital receipt and the Authority as the LPA. I would expect the LPA to ensure that no such tension exists and that Magor with Undy is not short changed. I would be extremely resistant to any proposals which do not appear to adequately reflect local requirements.

In terms of priorities, there are some clear areas which still require support.

1, The three fields site as a hub for community activity and a community hall to provide off site adult recreation. In terms of the significant time energy and resource, this ought to receive the principal level of priority.

2, Strategic Play provision suitable for older children (beyond 8). Located in the most well patronised existing play areas.

3, On site informal play, and an absence of “a springy chicken” approach.

4, Support for developing integrated public transport solutions and contribution for Magor Station Development.

5, Safe routes to Magor and Undy Primary Schools. Support for the development of active travel (walking and cycling) and alternative routes into Magor via Grange road and dancing hill.

6, Support for development of off-site sport and recreation pitches at Undy Football Club and Sycamore Playing field.

5.0 EVALUATION

5.1 Principle of the proposed development

5.1.1 Policy S1 of the LDP refers to the Spatial Distribution of new housing provision within the County and states that the main focus for new housing development will be within or adjoining main towns.

Outside of this Policy S1 sets out that a smaller amount of new housing development is provided in the Severnside sub-region, particularly at Magor/Undy, Caldicot/Portskewett and Sudbrook. As detailed previously Policy S3 of the LDP identifies seven strategic housing sites within Monmouthshire. Policy SAH5 relates to the Rockfield Farm site. Therefore the principle of redeveloping this site for a mixed use scheme, including residential, is already established.

Policy SAH5 of the LDP relates to the Rockfield Farm site and states:

11 hectares at the Rockfield Farm, Undy, site allocated for a mixed use residential and employment development. Planning permission will be granted provided that:

- a) Around 270 new dwellings are provided during the LDP period;**
- b) A Section 106 Agreement has been signed that, in addition to standard requirements, includes provision within the site for 2 hectares of serviced land for industrial and business development (Class B1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order);**
- c) The master plan for the development takes account of the SINC at the site;**

- d) A Section 106 Agreement has been signed that, in addition to standard requirements, includes provision for any necessary off-site highway improvements to the highway network through Magor/Undy;**
- e) A Section 106 Agreement has been signed that, in addition to standard requirements, includes provision for making an enhanced financial contribution to community facilities in the Magor/Undy area;**
- f) It is ensured that safeguarding routes for a potential Magor/Undy by-pass and for a potential M4 Relief Road are not prejudiced by the development.**

5.1.2 Consequently the issues that have arisen regarding the principle of the site for residential development and employment provision have already been addressed thoroughly as part of the LDP process as considered above by the LDP Inspector.

5.1.3 Whilst this is an outline planning application with access the only detail to be considered, extensive reports have been submitted with this application to work in conjunction with the overall Masterplan which had to be submitted as part of the outline submission.

The issues therefore to arise in the consideration of this application are as follows:

- Access
- Other Highway Considerations
- Policy DES2 *Areas of Amenity Importance*
- Landscape and Ecology
- Employment
- Residential Amenity
- Archaeology
- Noise
- Drainage and Water Supply

5.2 Access

5.2.1 As detailed previously the Transport Assessment considered two options for providing access to the site from the B4245 - one being a priority T-junction and the other a three-arm roundabout. The results of which indicated that a priority T-junction onto the B4245, designed to appropriate standard, would operate within capacity in all scenarios including additional traffic associated with development of the Vinegar Hill site and the impact of plans to develop a new M4 relief road around Newport. The proposed M4 relief road would have significant implications for traffic flows through Magor with Undy, as the new junction between Rogiet and Undy would mean traffic accessing the M4 from Rogiet, Caldicot and further east would no longer travel through Magor with Undy, although traffic from Magor and Undy themselves would be likely to travel from the west to access the M4 via the new junction if travelling eastwards on the M4. The proposed traffic arrangements have been considered for both with and without M4 relief road scenarios.

5.2.2 This has been considered and acceptable in principle by the Council's Highway Engineer subject to detailed design, safety audit and technical audit / review and the requirement for it to be constructed prior to the commencement of the development due to the strategic nature of the B4245. The junction would therefore be required to be carried out subject to a S106 agreement and the applicant / land owner entering into Section 278 Agreement, Highways Act 1980 with the Council as Highway Authority.

5.2.3 Access to the site from The Elms, an existing unclassified lane, has also been considered as part of the Transport Assessment. It will be required to be re-engineered

and traffic orders implemented to create a safe and manageable link for both pedestrians and cyclists between the proposed development and the existing Rockfield Grove development but at the same time restricting vehicle movement. This will help to ensure it cannot be used as a rat run, a concern expressed in a number of correspondence received from residential properties.

5.3 Other Highway Considerations

5.3.1 The requirement for a safeguarding route for the Magor/Undy By-pass which runs through the allocated site, has been carried through successive Development Plans over many years. This is highlighted in Policy MV10 of the LDP as well as criterion (f) of Policy SAH5.

5.3.2 As part of this application, and in response to queries raised by Councillor Taylor, the purpose of and need for this bypass route has been re-evaluated. The protected route runs through both the application site and the adjacent Vinegar Hill site and then on into 3rd party land to the west. The deliverability of this western section is currently unclear. The route itself would be undulating due to the topography, and would require a number of junctions to allow access to the residential and employment development. In reality it is unlikely to offer a more convenient route for road traffic. It is accepted that the western end of the bypass would have removed some traffic from the main road through Magor, however the road capacity has been assessed. The Transport Assessment concludes that the "safeguarding a route for a Magor/Undy by-pass to the south of the site as set out in the LDP is not necessary to facilitate the Rockfield Farm development in any of the development scenarios tested". As such Planning Policy have confirmed that compliance with this element of criterion (f), therefore, would no longer be required and the extension of the site to the south of the original SAH5 allocation into this location is considered acceptable.

5.3.3 The indicative Master Plan illustrates a local link road that would satisfy the need to provide for an east to west link between the proposed development and the adjacent allocated site at Vinegar Hill (Local Development Plan Policy SAH6). Again the Transport Assessment that informs this has been specifically modelled to take account of all scenarios including the M4 corridor around Newport. This link road will provide for permeability through the site and as such is considered to be good planning practice.

5.3.4 For the purposes of clarity, the proposed development is technically contrary to part f of Policy SAH5 because the by-pass is not being provided or safeguarded. The reason for this is set out above, and it is concluded that the bypass is not necessary and therefore this route need not be safeguarded.

5.4 Policy DES2 Areas of Amenity Importance

5.4.1 Policy DES2 of the LDP relates to Areas of Amenity Importance. The site extends to the south of the allocated SAH5 site boundary into an area of DES2 land. The majority of the DES2 land in this location is private farmland with no public access and no logical boundary. Consequently the land does not fulfil an amenity role, and was previously included as a buffer between the edge of the settlement and the indicative Magor/Undy By-pass link. In addition to this in relation to the adjacent allocation at Vinegar Hill the LDP Inspector stated in para 6.59 of the Inspector's Report that 'The southern margin of the site is currently designated as an Area of Amenity Importance and thus subject to Policy DES2. This designation was made, at least partially, to provide a buffer for the safeguarded route of the B4245 Magor/Undy By-Pass. It is now intended that this would take a meandering and traffic-calmed course through the site and that the need for a buffer would thus be negated (IMAC13)'. Further to this the Monmouthshire County

Council provided similar comments on this issue in the Vinegar Hill Examination Statement, para 6.3 noted 'It is recognised that the development of the site will result in the loss of an area of amenity open space. Therefore there is no Policy justification for this buffer to continue to be designated as an Area of Amenity Importance as detailed by Policy DES2.

5.4.2 However, open space and green space will be incorporated in the development. Provision for open space will be sought in accordance with the standards set out in LDP Policy CRF2 Outdoor Recreation/ Public Open Space/ Allotment Standards and Provision. The area of SINC would be retained as it is also proposed to provide links through this area that would actually bring this important green asset into public use. Furthermore the Council's Recreation Officer has requested contributions in respect of on and off site recreation. It must be noted that Magor has a surplus of public amenity open space when assessed against standards, although there is a deficiency in pitches for outdoor sport.

5.5. Landscape and Ecology

5.5.1 The application has been submitted with appropriate levels of ecological survey, tree survey and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).

The site has been identified by LANDMAP as being of high value for part of its historical and geological aspects and moderate value for its visual and sensory and landscape habitats and of low value for its cultural aspect area. The Monmouthshire Landscape sensitivity and capacity study has identified the site (a proposed candidate site CS/0249) as of high/medium sensitivity with the part of the site in which the development sits being of medium sensitivity due to the degraded urban fringe character.

The Council's Green Infrastructure (GI) Team note that the submitted documents, detailed above, represent a positive development to the integration of GI in this project and the GI team welcome the principals identified. They have however suggested the Indicative Masterplan and the Development Framework should be brought together in 2 plans retitled GI Masterplan and GI development framework. This would see all roads and housing layouts removed. The plans have not been amended in line with this suggestion, however given the outline nature of the application the road and housing layouts within the submitted plans are indicative only. The northern portion of the site, running parallel to the M4, is the most elevated and in line with comments received from the Landscape Officer the indicative Master Plan illustrates a new landscape buffer that would cloak the northern boundary of the site.

5.5.2 The Council's Biodiversity Officer has confirmed that the surveys and assessments provide enough information, at this time, to make a sound planning decision. Whilst the application is Outline only it does provide a Development Framework and Masterplan to identify the delivery expected for green infrastructure including things such as habitat to be retained, buffer strips and new habitat. The measures would need to be managed through appropriate planning condition.

5.5.3 As detailed previously within this report the Breezy Bank SINC is to be retained and a green buffer around it is proposed, however it will need to be protected during the development process and carefully managed in the future to ensure that its integral value is not degraded with increased public use. To ensure this conditions are to be attached requiring both a construction environment management plan (CEMP) and Green Infrastructure Management Plan for the site.

5.6 Employment

5.6.1 Criterion (b) of LDP site allocation Policy SAH5 requires the provision within the site for 2 hectares of serviced land for industrial and business development (Class B1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order).

5.6.2 The inclusion of 2ha to provide 5575m² B1(b) Research and Development complies with criterion (b) of SAH5 in principle. The S.106 agreement shall include details of this to ensure this does relate to serviced industrial and business land.

5.6.3 The indicative Master Plan indicates that the employment area would be provided in the north western portion of the site (referred to as Area C1). It is accepted that this is one of the highest points of the site and therefore most visually prominent, the area has been chosen in light of the Noise Assessment carried out in July 2016. The findings of which concluded that potential road traffic noise from the M4 would see part of the northern edge of the site fall within Noise Exposure Category C and therefore not suitable for residential use. Therefore the preferred siting of the employment use closer to the main site entrance onto the B4245 can be discounted for justifiable reasons. The scale and massing of the units would be considered at the Reserved Matters stage and in some instances would need to be single storey in the most north westerly corner of the site.

5.7 Residential Amenity

5.7.1 The site is bound along its south easterly edge by the residential properties of Rockfield Grove, Rockfield Way and Rockfield View. There is an established line of mature vegetation, including trees and hedgerow, which runs along this boundary which would be retained.

To ensure that the development does not adversely affect the amenity of the occupiers of the identified properties, this aspect would be addressed through layout and design at the Reserved Matters stage.

5.7.2 The Master Plan seeks to maximise linkages to the existing residential areas rather than disconnect itself from them. Improved play space at Rockfield View and public links to the Breezy Bank SINC would also provide existing residents access to welcome recreational space.

5.7.3 A number of concerns have been raised in respect of increased traffic congestion as a result of the development. However, as detailed previously the Transport Assessment has identified that subject to securing appropriate infrastructure improvements the development is acceptable in principle with regard to traffic congestion.

5.8 Archaeology

5.8.1 Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust (GGAT) have identified an archaeological restraint on the site. An archaeological field evaluation was conducted in January 2017 saw the recovery of prehistoric material in of the fields. Whilst GGAT noted that the findings may not be of national importance they were of the view that they held regional significance and would be impact by the proposed development. In their initial consultation response GGAT recommended a condition be attached to any consent requiring a written scheme of investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological work. The applicant has undertaken this scheme in advance which details a methodology for the recording of all archaeological remains that survive in the application area. The WSI has been accepted by GGAT as being a coherent and appropriate mitigation strategy. An alternative condition has therefore been requested to ensure adherence with the mitigation strategy.

5.9 Environmental Health Considerations

5.9.1 Technical Advice Note (TAN) 11: Noise (1997) sets out Welsh Government guidance on how the planning system can be used to minimise the adverse impact of noise without placing unreasonable restrictions on development. The TAN sets out four noise exposure categories (NECs) that sites may fall in, taking account of both day and night-time noise levels. For the purposes of clarity the NECs in TAN11 are set out in the table below:

A	Noise need not be considered as a determining factor in granting planning permission, although the noise level at the high end of the category should not be regarded as desirable.
B	Noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications and, where appropriate, conditions imposed to ensure an adequate level of protection.
C	Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example, because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise.
D	Planning permission should normally be refused.

5.9.2 The applicant has undertaken an appropriate Noise Assessment which takes account of the adjoining housing site at Vinegar Hill (SAH6) as well as modelling scenarios with and without the M4 corridor around Newport. An update to the original survey (June 2016) in January 2016 concluded that confirm that no proposed residential buildings will be subject to NEC D, and that residential areas would be exposed to noise levels equivalent to NEC C as a worst case. The most significant impact would be the predicted levels with the works the M4 corridor at night without any form of mitigation which would result in over half of the site fall into NEC C. Consequently the Assessment puts forward options for noise mitigation strategies including:

- *Noise barrier at the northern site boundary, 6m in height and approximately 100m long;*
- *Re-orientation of buildings at this parcel (C2) such that private gardens are screened by the same dwellings. It is further recommended that the internal layout of each dwelling is designed to avoid habitable rooms overlooking the M4.*

5.9.3 The first option, of a 6m high fence, is considered unlikely to be unacceptable for a number of planning reasons including visual impact, maintenance and structural integrity. However, this option could be revisited if necessary at the relevant reserved matters stage. The second option could be fully considered with the subsequent applications for reserved matters. The detailed design would consider building orientation as well as suitable façade mitigation.

5.9.4 The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has expressed concerns with the fact that there are significant areas proposed which fall into Category C (based on worst case scenario detailed in 5.9.2). As such the EHO is of the view that the matter should be addressed and an acceptable scheme submitted in order that an informed decision can be made at outline planning stage. However, given the scale of the development, which has been through the LDP examination procedure, it is not considered that there are other sites suitable in the locality of providing the required housing numbers. Therefore turning back to TAN11 whilst on the basis of the M4 corridor going ahead a large portion of the site would be within Category C, it is considered on balance that in

the absence of suitable alternative, quieter sites that conditions could be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise. Such a condition would need to take account of the phased nature of the development as a formalised layout has not been established owing to the outline nature of the application. It is also noted that the main impact would occur during night hours and mechanical mitigation could be used to achieve acceptable internal noise levels to bedrooms. Noise impact during night hours to external garden areas is not considered to be unacceptable. The noise survey does show that even in the event of the M4 corridor going ahead garden areas in the day time would mostly fall within NEC B.

5.9.5 A contaminated land site investigation has been submitted, the results of the areas surveyed showed did not identify any contaminants of concern, although these were undeveloped parts of the site. The higher risk area around the farm buildings, also the location of an old quarry, would require further investigation which the EHO has advised would need to be done when a firmer plan for the site has been developed.

5.9.6 The Air Quality Assessment submitted confirms that would not create any exceedances of the nitrogen dioxide air quality objective at existing or future receptors for the operational phase. This was found to be the case irrespective on if the M4 relief road was built or not.

5.10 Drainage and Water Supply

5.10.1 The Drainage Strategy has been provided which considers the requirements of LDP Policies SD4 and EP2. The Strategy has been designed so that sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) are integral to the site. This would incorporate attenuation areas, rainwater harvesting, swales and permeable surfaces into an interlinked drainage system that will drain the net increase of surface water run-off from the new development. Currently the preferred option to manage the majority of the site surface water run-off is to attenuate and discharge at the pro rata'd Qbar rate, however whether a suitable means of discharge is readily available at this time is still to be determined it is therefore necessary for the applicant to carry out further detailed analysis and investigation to identify and substantiate an appropriate point of discharge to the local drainage land drainage network, Pratt Reen.

5.10.2 It is proposed that all the foul flows from the site would be discharged into existing public sewers and a hydraulic modelling assessment of the site has been undertaken by the developers to assess the ability of the existing sewers to accommodate the proposed development. No objection has been raised by Welsh Water who have advised that once a preferred developer is in place that they engaged with to develop solutions for both foul and potable water.

5.11 Planning Contributions

5.11.1 Policy SAH5 sets out a number of planning contributions required in respect of this site including provision within the site for 2 hectares of serviced land for industrial and business development, necessary off site highway improvements and an enhanced contribution to community facilities in the Magor/Undy area. As detailed previously within this report the first two of these requirements will be met. With regard to enhanced community facilities it is acknowledged that evidence shows that there is a large shortfall in off-site recreation provision and a shortage of play provision in Magor and Undy. As such the scheme would contribute £175k towards equipped play (£100k of which would go to enhance existing play at Rockfield View) and £800k towards off site adult recreation. The latter figure was originally £850k however £50k was not attributed to a

particular project and therefore failed the three tests. Various beneficiaries for the adult recreation sum have been considered however it is considered on balance that the “Three Fields” community site would be the most appropriate to achieve the aspirations of Policy SAH5. The site is also an identified community priority.

5.11.2 The development would generate approximately 59 pupils, as detailed within section 4.1 of this report officers within the Education department have confirmed that all schools within catchment have capacity and therefore no financial contribution towards education is sought.

5.11.3 In addition contributions in respect of active travel and public transport have been sought. £175k is to be paid over a period of five years that would go towards improving the local bus service. A further £70k towards the Magor/Undy to Rogiet footpath would also be secured in line with the aspirations of the Active Travel Act.

An original request was made for a contribution of up to £700k towards the cost of progressing the Magor/Undy train station, this figure has now been reduced to £200k. Officers consider this initial request as excessive in the scale of the development and considering other financial contributions being sought. A contribution is still to be provided towards a key local project. Officers are of the opinion that other contributions in respect of affordable housing, other highway improvements and Three Fields community facility were of higher local priority.

5.11.4 Finally the scheme would deliver 25% of the total number of units to be affordable housing which is in line with the Policy requirements of the LDP.

5.12 Response to Consultation Responses

5.12.1 A number of the concerns raised by third parties have already been addressed in the preceding sections of this report and these shall not be repeated. However other material planning issues have been raised. Other concerns relate to the possible community benefits, by virtue of the Section 106 agreement, including recreation space and the proposed rail station. The full heads of terms in respect of this are detailed in Section 6 below.

5.13 Response to the Representations of the Community/ Town Council (if applicable) Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015

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

5.14 Conclusion

5.14.1 This site has been allocated as a strategic development site within the adopted LDP and therefore the principle of the development is already established. The site can accommodate up to 266 dwellings while still providing a considerable amount of green infrastructure, including the preservation of an existing SINC. In addition the site provides 2 hectares of land to be made available for employment (Use Class B1). It is acknowledged that the site would see a tangible increase in the population of Undy, however planning contributions (set out below) in respect of recreation, the

Three Fields community site, assistance in the delivery of the Magor/Undy train station as well as improvements to the existing bus service are to be provided. Furthermore 25% of the total number of residential units would be secured as much needed Affordable Homes.

5.14.2 Therefore whilst local concerns in respect of the settlement being incapable of accommodating additional residential units are noted, it is considered on balance that subject to the planning contributions and conditions detailed in Section 6 below that this outline application is acceptable.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Subject to a Planning Contributions, the Heads of Terms are identified below:

1. **£175,000 for off-site and on site equipped play, including £100k to improve play area at Rockfield View.**
2. **£800,000 for off-site adult recreation to the Three Fields site.**
3. **£200,000 towards the delivery of the Magor/Undy station.**
4. **£175,000 (over a period of 5 years) towards public transport to develop the existing bus service.**
5. **£70,000 towards the Magor/Undy to Rogiet footpath.**
6. **25% of the total number of dwellings shall be allocated to Affordable Housing.**
7. **Provision within the site for 2 hectares of serviced land for industrial and business development (Class B1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order).**
8. **Prior to the occupation of any units comprised in Area C1 the link road shall be completed up to the site boundary with the adjoining Vinegar Hill (SAH6) site.**

And to enter into a Section 278 Agreement of The Highways Act 1980 to cover:

1. **Prior to the commencement of the development for the construction of the new highway junction off the B4245 and these works will be completed by the owners prior to commencement of the development.**
2. **Prior to the commencement of the development for the Elms Road improvement.**

Conditions:

1	Approval of the details of the siting, design and external appearance of the building(s), the means of access and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called the reserved matters) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on site. Reason: The application is in outline only.
2	a) Application for approval of all the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission b) The development hereby approved must be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later. Reason: In order to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

3.	The development shall be carried out in accordance with the list of approved plans set out in the table below. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt
	<u>Pre-commencement conditions</u>
4.	<p>No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) in each reserved matters area until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities. b) Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”. c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction including. d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features. e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works. f) Responsible persons and lines of communication. g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person. h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs. <p>The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Reason: to safeguard Priority Habitats and Protected species during development in accordance with LDP policy NE1 and The Environment (Wales) Act 2016.</p>
5.	<p>Full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in conjunction with each reserved matters application for landscaping. These details should reflect the guidelines set out in the GI Masterplan plan. Details shall include [for example]:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed plans / elevations of the proposed building • proposed finished levels or contours; • means of enclosure; • car parking layouts; • other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; • hard surfacing materials; • proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, • communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports and CCTV installations.); • retained historic or other landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. • Water Features • Clarification of access connections beyond the site • Where historic environment impacts are identified these are reflected through appropriate mitigation. <p>Reason: To ensure the provision afforded by appropriate landscape design and Green Infrastructure.</p>
6.	Each reserved matters application for layout shall include existing and proposed site sections as well as proposed finished floor levels to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

	<p>Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of maintaining the amenity value of the area.</p>
7.	<p>Before any works commence on site, a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This boundary treatment shall be implemented :</p> <p>a) before the use hereby approved is commenced or</p> <p>b) before the building(s) is / are occupied or</p> <p>c) in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area.</p>
8.	<p>Prior to any works commencing on site a Construction Management Plan (CMP) in each reserved matters area shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, which shall include traffic management measures, hours of working, measures to control dust, noise and related nuisances, and measures to protect adjoining users from construction works. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CMP.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in a safe and considerate manner</p>
9.	<p>No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured implementation of a programme of Archaeological work in accordance with that out-lined in "Rockfield Farm, Undy, Monmouthshire Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Works Version 2" (Dyfed Archaeological Trust (Project no. FS16-096, dated April 2017).</p> <p>Reason: To identify and record any features of archaeological interest discovered during the works, in order to mitigate the impact of the works on the archaeological resource.</p>
10.	<p>No development shall commence until a foul water drainage scheme to satisfactorily accommodate the foul water discharge from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved details shall evidence that no surface water and/or land drainage shall be allowed to connect directly or indirectly with the public sewerage network.</p> <p>Thereafter, no part of the development shall be brought into use and no dwelling shall be occupied until the agreed foul drainage system has been constructed, completed and brought into use in accordance with the approved scheme.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no pollution of or detriment to the environment.</p>
11.	<p>No trees or shrubs are to be removed on each reserved matters area until there has been submitted and agreed in writing a scheme of tree protection in accordance with information shown in the Pre-development Tree Survey dated March 2016. The information shall contain the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A tree retention and removal plan. • A scaled tree protection plan showing retained trees and their root protection areas on the proposed layout. • An Arboricultural Method Statement showing how trees/shrubs may be protected from harm where construction activity within any root protection area is unavoidable.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A scheme of access facilitation pruning. • Tree protection barrier details. • A scheme of arboricultural monitoring over the course of the development. <p>Reason To ensure the long term health and viability of valuable green infrastructure assets in accordance with Policy S13 – Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment.</p>
	Pursuant to submission of Reserved Matters
12.	In conjunction with the submission of the first of the reserved matters, a phasing strategy for the whole site shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The strategy will include development, physical and green infrastructure, and recreation/open space provision. The implementation of the site shall be undertaken in accordance with that phasing strategy.
13.	Each reserved matters application for layout shall include a detailed surface water management scheme, which shall include the programme for its implementation; the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details prior to first occupation of any associated dwelling/building. Reason: To ensure that surface water on site is managed in a sustainable manner and flood risk is kept to a minimum in accordance with Local Development Plan Policy SD4 LDP Sustainable Drainage.
14.	<p>A Green Infrastructure Management Plan shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority with the first reserved matters application. The content of the Management Plan shall include the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Description and evaluation of Green Infrastructure assets to be managed. b) Trends and constraints on site that might influence management. c) Aims and objectives of management. d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives. e) Prescriptions for management actions. f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a twenty-year period). g) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan. h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures. i) A schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of five years. <p>The Management Plan shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the Green Infrastructure Management Plan are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning Green Infrastructure objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To maintain and enhance Green Infrastructure Assets in accordance with LDP policies, DES1, S13, GI1, NE1, EP1 and SD4.</p>

	(Legislative background – Well Being of Future Generations Act 2015, Planning (Wales) Act 2015 Environment (Wales) Act 2016).
15.	<p>Reserved matters applications for layout and appearance shall include a “lighting design strategy for biodiversity” to be submitted for approval in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall:</p> <p>a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for biodiversity and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places. All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard habitat used by foraging and commuting species and to limit adverse changes to behaviour of biodiversity in accordance with LDP Policy EP3.</p>
16.	<p>Each reserved matters application for layout shall include a potable water scheme to satisfactorily accommodate the water usage from the site to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, no development shall be brought into use and no dwelling shall be occupied until the agreed foul drainage system has been constructed, completed in accordance with the approved scheme.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure each property can be served with an adequate water supply.</p>
17.	<p>Details of for the re-engineering and change of use for The Elms shall be submitted in conjunction with the relevant reserved matters application for layout. The development shall be carried out in accordance with those approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the existing public highway is re-engineered in the interest of highway safety and Local Development Plan Policy MV1.</p>
18.	<p>Each reserved matters applications for layout and appearance shall include full details of noise mitigation for each dwelling to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of each dwelling.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of the dwellings and ensure compliance with Policy EP1 of the Local Development Plan.</p>
	Compliance conditions
19.	<p>If the demolition of Rockfield Farmhouse and associated outbuildings does not commence (or, having commenced, is suspended for more than 12 months) within 1 year from the date of the planning consent, a review of bat roost and nesting bird potential shall be reconsidered. The review shall be informed by further ecological surveys commissioned to</p> <p>i) establish if there have been any changes in the presence and/or abundance of bats or nesting birds and ii) identify any likely new ecological impacts that might arise from any changes. Where the</p>

	<p>survey results indicate that changes have occurred that will result in ecological impacts not previously addressed in the approved scheme, the original approved ecological measures will be revised and new or amended measures, and a timetable for their implementation, will be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of stripping and demolition of the Farmhouse and outbuildings. Works will then be carried out in accordance with the proposed new approved ecological measures and timetable.</p> <p>Reason: To review impacts on protected and priority species prior to development in accordance with LDP Policy NE1 and The Environment (Wales) Act 2016.</p>
20.	<p>All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations of appropriate British Standards or other recognised Codes of Good Practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.</p>

Information Notes

Bats - Please note that Bats are protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). This protection includes bats and places used as bat roosts, whether a bat is present at the time or not. If bats are found during the course of works, all works must cease and Natural Resources Wales contacted immediately (0300 065 3000).

Nesting birds - Please note that all birds are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The protection also covers their nests and eggs. To avoid breaking the law, do not carry out work on trees, hedgerows or buildings where birds are nesting. The nesting season for most bird species is between March and September.

Badgers - Please note that Badgers are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. It is illegal to wilfully kill, injure, take, possess or cruelly ill-treat a badger, or attempt to do so; to intentionally or recklessly interfere with a badger sett by damaging or destroying it; to obstruct access, or any entrance of, a badger sett and to disturb a badger when it is occupying a sett. To avoid breaking the law, follow the advice provided by the consultant ecologist and if work is within 30m of a sett consult with Natural Resources Wales.

The archaeological work must be undertaken to the appropriate Standard and Guidance set by Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), (www.archaeologists.net/codes/ifa) and it is recommended that it is carried out either by a CIfA Registered Organisation (www.archaeologists.net/ro) or an accredited Member.

The Local Planning Authority is to be notified of the commencement of site works. A copy of a standard form is attached to this consent for this purpose.

Any person carrying out the development to which this planning permission relates must display at or near the place where the development is being carried out, at all times when it is being carried out, a copy of any notice of the decision to grant it, in accordance with Schedule 5B to the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012 as amended and Section 71ZB of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 34 of the Planning (Wales) Act 2015.

Street Naming/Numbering - The Naming & Numbering of streets and properties in Monmouthshire is controlled by Monmouthshire County Council under the Public Health Act 1925 - Sections 17 to 19, the purpose of which is to ensure that any new or converted properties are allocated names or numbers logically and in a consistent manner. To register a new or converted property please view Monmouthshire Street Naming and Numbering Policy and complete the application form which can be viewed on the Street Naming & Numbering page at www.monmouthshire.gov.uk

This facilitates a registered address with the Royal Mail and effective service delivery from both Public and Private Sector bodies and in particular ensures that Emergency Services are able to locate any address to which they may be summoned. It cannot be guaranteed that the name you specify in the planning application documents for the address of the site will be the name that would be formally agreed by the Council's Street Naming and Numbering Officer because it could conflict with the name of a property within the locality of the site that is already in use.

The reserved matters application(s) for the site should include a scheme of biodiversity enhancements which shall build upon the recommendations of the submitted ecological reports:

Rockfield Farm, Undy, Monmouthshire An Ecological Survey Report by Just Mammals Consultancy LLP on behalf of Monmouthshire County Council dated February 2016
And Rockfield Farm, Undy, Monmouthshire An extended Phase 1 habitat and species assessment and bat and bird survey by Just Mammals Consultancy LLP on behalf of Monmouthshire County Council dated August 2014.

The proposed development (including any demolition) has been screened under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations and it is considered that an Environmental Statement is not required.