Statement in Support to

Welsh Government's Planning Inspector

Concerning

Candidate Site (No. 308)

for

Open Market and Affordable Housing

at

Land Adjacent to Temple House Square & Compass Pembrokeshire

David Haward Associates Chartered Architects Twll Dwrgi Goat Street St David's SA62 6UR

June 2019

Telephone 01437 729090

CONTENTS

- 1.00 INTRODUCTION
- 2.00 SITE DETAILS AND ASSESSMENT
- 3.00 CONCLUSION
- 4.00 APPENDICIES

1.00 INTRODUCTION

- 1.01 The Local Development Plan II (end date 2031) was published on 28 March 2019.
- 1.02 Candidate Site (No. 308) located in Square and Compass was accepted as an Exceptional Site, the consequences of this, is that it is only suitable for Affordable Housing. The authority have a responsibility to ensure any candidate sites will be developed in the plan period. 100% Affordable Housing severely reduces the prospect of the site being developed.
- 1.03 It is the objector's position that the site was not properly assessed, as two other sites identified in the settlement area are very similar and in some respects score lower in the Site Assessment Criteria.
- 1.04 This Statement will outline the main considerations.

2.00 SITE DETAILS AND ASSESSMENT

- 2.01 The site falls within the settlement area of Square and Compass. However the settlement area is somewhat fragmented, please refer to C28 Proposals Map (Appendix I). In additional the boundary between the National Park and Pembrokeshire County Council is along the main road, being the A 478 Fishguard St David's road.
- 2.02 The Candidate Site was submitted as part of the review of the Register of Candidate Sites published in July 2017. This Register listed two Candidate Sites situated in Square and Compass.
- 2.03 The village itself could be described as a "linear village" having grown up along the A 478. However, somewhat unusually it has developed in a somewhat piecemeal fashion, in that there are large spaces between either individual properties or in groups of 2 - 6.
- 2.04 The proposed Candidate Site is situated between the former Temple Farm and Belle Vue. As such it would give some consolidation to the village. Please refer to Architect's Indicative Site Plan (Appendix II)
- 2.05 It should be noted, that part of this rural centre lies outside the National Park. The border being the main A 478 Fishguard - St David's road. Please refer to PCC Proposals Map for Square and Compass (Appendix III).
- 2.06 The current Planning Policy Wales, Edition 10 (PPW, Ed 10) refers a number of themes, one being Active and Social Places which covers the well-connected cohesive community's components of place making. This in turn is made up of several key components including the need for Sustainable Transport. The site is well connected to both Public Transport, with regular Bus Services to Service Centres as well as the Railway System. This aspect must be considered when assessing Candidate Sites.
- 2.07 Section 4.2 Housing, paragraph 4.2.1 includes "New housing development in both urban and rural areas should incorporate a <u>mix</u> of market and affordable house types,"
- 2.08 The site has been assessed as an Exceptional Site, which is generally reserved for sites that may become available during the plan period, but are outside the settlement boundary. These sites are general reserved for affordable housing, as local need helps justify the development in the countryside.
- 2.09 The submission of Candidate Sites is to help formulate the new Local Development Plan, sometimes referred to as LDP 2. As a consequence all Candidate Sites are considered against Sustainability and a more detailed Assessment.
- 2.10 The call for Candidate Sites produced two sites, listed below:-

Site No.	Location	Use	Notes
014	Glasfryn Field	Affordable Housing / Mixed Housing	Failed Candidate Site Assessment Criterion 2 as it was Greenfield. PCNPA subdivided site to create 014A.
014A	Glasfryn Field	Affordable Housing / Mixed Housing	Revised site estimated to provide 7 Units, but may not take into account the need for access to the rear field.
106	Land Adj. Bryngolau	Housing	This site too failed on Criterion 2 as it was Greenfield.

2.11 Following publication of Candidate Site Register, a further site was submitted for Square and Compass:-

Site No.	Location	Use	Notes
308	Land Adj. Temple House	Affordable Housing / Mixed Housing	Site incorrectly assessed as a Greenfield and assessed as an Exceptional site.

- 2.12 PPW, Ed 10 4.2.16 advises that "...planning authorities must follow the search sequence...starting with the re-use of previously developed and/ or <u>underutilised</u> land within settlements, then land on the edge of settlements and <u>then</u> greenfield land"
- 2.13 LDP II has identified Site No. 14A as HA13 and Site No. 106 as HA14 under Policy 47 Housing (strategy Policy). Site No. 308 was not considered suitable for Housing Allocation but would be suitable for exceptional land release. Please refer to Candidate Site Assessment (No. 308) (Appendix IV).
- 2.14 Turning to assessments of sites HA13 and HA14, please refer to the two attached Candidate Site Assessments 014 and 106 (Appendices V & VI). Section 1 Key Questions has slightly unusual assessments.

Key Questions	014	106	308	Comments
A	Yes with mitigation	Yes	Yes	See question 27
В	No	No	Possibility	No issues with drainage are known. Checking LIS costs were same on 3 sites
С	No history	No history	No history	
D	Yes	Yes	Yes – affordable housing exception site	Dwelling No's are Site 014 10, 106 7, 308 8 units.

- 2.15 From the above and referring to The Land Implementation Study, the site 308 was incorrectly assessed and should have been rated Yes in "D".
- 2.16 Section 2 Detailed Site Appraisal also contained a number of errors. A summary of the three sites is given below, together with our comments.

No.	Criterion	014	106	308	Comments
1	Is the site within or adjoining an existing centre	Adjoining	Adjoining	Adjoining	
2	Located on Brownfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	014 & 106 are agricultural fields. 308 is "waste ground" uncultivated.
3	Loss of Agricultural Land	Grade 3a	Grade 3a	Grade 3a	308 is not Agricultural land.
4	Site Access	Yes with improvements	Yes with improvements	Yes with improvements	
		improvements	improvements	improvements	

No.	Criterion	014	106	308	Comments
5	Highway Capable	Yes with improvements	Yes with improvements	Various	Reference made to 50mph. All sites affected. Site is under 10 units.
6	Availability of Public Transport	than 5 buses/trains per day.	Yes more than 5 buses/trains per day	Yes more than 5 buses/trains per day	
7	Loss of open space	No	No	No	
8	Within 100m of utilities	Yes	Yes	Yes	
9	Foul water capacity	Yes	Yes	Various	Drainage for 308 is the same as 014 & 106.
10	Adjacent Employment	Not Close	Not Close	Not Close, garage nearby.	Also Public House.
11	Bad Neighbour	N/A	N/A	N/A	
12	Negative on biodiversity at International level	No	No	No	
13	Negative on biodiversity at national level	No	No	No	
14	Negative on biodiversity at local level	No	No	No	
15	Near Geodiversity Site	No	No	No	
16	Biodiversity Outcome	Positive	Negative	Neutral	014 and 106 are similar fields
17	Mature Trees or Hedgerows	No	No	Negative	308 due to lack of cultivation has become scrub, but does not contain any trees, saplings range 10 – 60mm dia.
18	Protected species	No	Unknown – Survey required	Unknown – Survey required	
19	Located near or in open space	No	No	No	
20	Located near or in heritage site	No	No	No	
21	Within or Adj. Conservation Area	No	No	No	
22	Listed Buildings	No	No	No	
23	Monuments	No	No	No	

No.	Criterion	014	106	308	Comments
24	Flood Risk Area	No	No	No	
25	Flood Risk Prone Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	
26	Topographical Characteristics	No	No	No	
27	Detrimental impact on character of Centre	Yes but can be mitigated	Yes but can be mitigated	Yes but can be mitigated	Please refer to Note 1 below.
28	Potentially contaminated land	No	No	No	
29	Minerals Area	No	No	No	
30	Stability issues	No	No	No	
	Overall Assessment and Recommendation	Please refer to report	Please refer to report	Please refer to report	Please refer to Note 2 below.

Note 1

All three sites are similar in being fronted with a mature hedgerow. The commentary noted that site 308 was suitable as an infill site. The suggested site (308) layout (Appendix II) retained some of this hedgerow to help integrate the development and to give a similar appearance to the development carried out at Temple to the West. The site (308) being narrower will have a reduced impact on the village than 014 and 106. The observation of being further from the garage and public house is marginal, as the site is only 225m away. The observation of no development opposite, does not justify why this should prevent its inclusion. It could equally be argued that it would help consolidate this fragmented village.

Note 2

The site assessment makes reference to 5 units due to Highway concerns. All three sites are similar in that they are well within the 50 mph zone. In addition, it is stated in other supporting documents that the Highway Authority have concerns on developments above 10 units, rather than 5. As previously stated, developments with 100% affordable housing seldom get implemented. Furthermore it is noted that Site 106 has a Public Footpath along the west boundary so will either need to be protected or diverted. Any protection will have a negative effect on its character.

2.17 All three sites scored the same on Candidate Site – Sustainability Appraisal.

3.00 Conclusion

- 3.01 All three sites are similar in size and location. However, Site No. 308 will not result in the loss of any agricultural land. This alone should have suggested the site is more appropriate for development than the others.
- 3.02 Site No. 106 is less desirable as it requires either the protection or diversion of a Public Footpath.
- 3.03 Some of the assessment is a little judgemental and in places inaccurate. As Site 308 was submitted after the Candidate Site Register had been published, there may have been a reluctance to re-assess sites 014 and 106. However, considering the shortage of both affordable and open market housing in the area, any additional sites that comply with policy should be supported. From experience, not all the sites will be developed during the plan period.
- 3.04 Candidate site 014 was designated 14A as it was part of a larger candidate site. Access to remainder of the site will be required for either use of the field or as a potential second phase, thus reducing the available site area for development.

4.00 APPENDICIES

Appendix I	PCNPA C28 Proposals Map (From current LDP)	
Appendix II	Architect's drawing 899.02 Indicate Site Plan	
Appendix III	PCC Proposals Map (From current LDP)	
Appendix IV	Candidate Site No. 308 Assessment	
Appendix V	Candidate Site No. 014 Assessment	
Appendix VI	Candidate Site No. 106 Assessment	

David Haward Associates Chartered Architects Twll Dwrgi Goat Street St David's SA62 6RQ

Telephone 01437 729090

DDH/ddh/899/SoSWG.01 (June 2019)

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority - copyright licence/account number 100022534. Atgynhyrchwyd o fapiau Arolwg Ordnans gyda chaniatâd Rheolwr Llyfrfa Ei Mawrhydi. © Hawlfraint y Goron . Mae atgynhyrchu anawdurdodedig yn torri Hawlfraint y Goron ac fe allai arwain ar erlyniad neu achos sifil. Awdurdod Parc Cenedlaethol Arfordir Penfro - rhif cyfrif/trwydded hawlfraint 10002253



Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan - end date 2021. Adopted Plan September 2010 Key Diagram and Proposals Maps Parc Cenedlaethol Arfordir Penfro Cynlluniau Datblygu Lleol - hyd at ddiwedd 2021. Cynllun Mabwysiedig Medi 2010 Diagram Allweddol a Mapiau Cynigion



		L	
Dwelling Type 4P/3B 4P/3B 4P/3B 4P/3B 4P/3B 4P/3B 4P/2B 4P/2B	Occupancy Unit Type AH AH OM OM OM OM AH AH		
e indicative. E shire Housing st National Par	Details to be Association rk Authority.		
		TK	
FISH	IGUARD		
1			
	Cha	vid Haward Associates artered Architects w.dhaarchitects.co.uk 37 729 090	<i>4</i>
tive Site Plan	Res Fiel Ten Cro	ndidate Site for sidential Development At Id No. 1728 adjacent to nple, Square and Compa pesgoch nbrokeshire	55



က / Licence No. 100023 wydded 100023344 ce Surv ns Rhif പ itabase rights 2013 Ordnan a ddata 2013 Arolwg Ordna 50 ronf) © Crown copyriç int y Goron a haw \frown \leq p C D (1) ed upon the Ordnanc Yn seiliedig a'r Ordi ã









Site Location	Land adjacent to Temple House, Square and Compass
Community	Llanrhian
Site Number	308
Representor Number	4577
Proposed Use	Housing

Candidate Site Assessment

Section 1 – Key Questions

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
A	Is the site compatible with the National Park Purposes and Duty?	The site represents an infill area laid to scrub with good screening and would not intersect key views. See question no. 27 for further detail.	Yes
В	Is there evidence to question the viability or deliverability of the site?	Viability information for affordable housing has been submitted. The Land Implementation Study identified high costs for drainage.	Possibly
С	Does the site have a planning history?		No history
D	Is the site compatible with the Preferred Strategy of the Replacement Local Development Plan?		Yes – affordable housing exception site

Section 2 – Detailed Site Appraisal

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
1	Is the site within or adjoining an existing Centre?		Adjoining edge of Centre

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
2	Is the site located on previously developed (brownfield) land, as defined by Planning Policy Wales (figure 4.4)		Greenfield
3	Would the development of the site result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?	ALC Grade 3a	Grade 3a
4	Is the site accessible from a public highway?	A new access would need to be created. Further feasibility assessment would be required to determine whether a suitable vehicle access could be established.	No
5	Is the nearby highway network capable of	The Land Implementation Study advises the following:	Yes
	accommodating the resulting traffic movements?	Highway deficiencies could create a potential barrier to housing delivery	Yes – with improvements
		at this site. The access road is characterised by fast moving traffic (50 mph). PCC Highways Meeting (20/09/2017) additional comment - 10 dwellings is considered a high number based on the existing characteristics of the settlement, as well as the nature of passing traffic at reasonably high speed. Circa 5 dwellings would be considered a more acceptable proposal.	No
6	Is public transport available?		Yes – more than 5 buses/trains per day
7	Would the development of the site result in the loss of publicly accessible open space?		Would not result in a loss
8	Is the site within 100m of existing water, sewerage, electrical, gas and telecommunications systems?		Yes
9	Is there a possible infrastructure capacity issue	Sewage capacity exists for the site for foul flows only. Further	No
	that could act as a constraint to development?	investigation into drainage is required.	Yes – but can be addressed through

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
			investigation/mitigation
			Yes
10	If the site is proposed for residential development, how does it relate to any employment uses adjacent to the site?	There is a garage nearby.	Not close to employment uses
11	If the site is proposed for 'bad neighbour' development – ie employment are there any residential properties within 400m of the site?		N/A
12	Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at an international level?		No
13	Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a national level?		No
14	Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a local level?		No
15	Is the site within or adjacent to a Regionally Important Geodiversity Site?		No
16	What is the outcome of the biodiversity assessment (if applicable ¹)?	Site appears to be mostly rank grassland, bramble scrub and more mature scrub such as gorse. Although of some local significance for ecology it does not appear as though there are any priority habitats present. Some mitigation within the landscaping will likely be required, although there will not be any major ecological issues.	Neutral

¹ This appraisal will be undertaken for sites which are considered suitable for inclusion in the Plan only.

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
17	Is there a threat to mature trees or hedgerows within or adjacent to the site?	Some mature trees may be present in amongst scrub growth. Mature hedgerow screens the site from the road. Thin natural boundary to the East.	Within
18	Is the development of the site likely to affect the habitat, breeding site or	Further survey work required.	No
	resting place of a protected species?		Potentially
			Yes
19	Is the site located within or close to a designated open space?		No
20	Is the site located within or close to an area designated for cultural heritage importance?		No
21	Is the site within or adjacent to a Conservation Area?		No
22	Are there any Listed Buildings within or adjacent to the site?		No
23	Are there any Scheduled Ancient Monuments within or adjacent to the site?		No
24	Is the site located within or adjacent to an area prone to flood risk?		No

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
25	If the site is within or adjacent to an area prone to flooding is the risk acceptable, having regards to vulnerability of the development proposed.		N/A
26	Do the topographical characteristics of the site present an obstacle to development?		No
27	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on the character of the Centre or locality?	This site represents a potential infill plot of land with neighbouring residential development to the east and west. The main road runs adjacent the southern boundary, divided by a mature high level hedgerow that currently screens the site and prevents key views to the coastal headland to the north. This would require partial removal to gain access. The land is laid to scrub. The site would be less well related to the village core than other Candidate Sites to the west (Site Refs 014 and 106), which are closer to the garage and pub, there is also no corresponding development across the road to the south. The site also currently serves as a visual break in the frontage. For these reasons it is considered that the other available sites within Square and Compass should be prioritised (Site Refs 014 and 106).	Yes but can be mitigated
28	Is there evidence that the site could consist of potentially contaminated land?		No
29	Is the site within a minerals safeguarding zone?		No

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
30	Is the land likely to be adversely affected by stability issues?		No

Overall Assessment:

The site is submitted for housing in a potential infill plot. The submission proposes 8 units, 4 of which would be affordable, with supporting viability information. However the Highways Authority has raised concerns with this level of development, with circa 5 units recommended. Further information is required to establish the financial viability of providing affordable housing on this basis.

The site is considered to be less well related to the village core than other Candidate Sites to the west (Site Refs 014 and 106), which are closer to the garage and pub, there is also no corresponding development across the road to the south. The site also currently serves as a visual break in the frontage.

For these reasons it is considered that the other available sites within Square and Compass should be prioritised (Site Refs 014 and 106). However, due to the landscape capacity for some form of development on this site, the approach that would best support the Plan's strategy (in the provision of affordable housing) would be to omit site from the revised Centre boundary, where only an exceptional land release for 100% affordable housing would be acceptable in principle, subject to detailed material planning considerations being deemed acceptable.

Recommendation			
Compliant with the draft Preferred Strategy	Yes	Further Information Required	No

Site Location	Glasfryn Field
Community	Llanrhian
Site Number	014
Representor Number	4434
Proposed Use	Affordable housing/Mixed Housing

Candidate Site Assessment

Section 1 – Key Questions

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
A	Is the site compatible with the National Park Purposes and Duty?	Development of part of the site is considered to be compatible (see question 27 of the Detailed Appraisal below and the link to Map 014A on the Candidate Site Register)	Yes with mitigation
В	Is there evidence to question the viability or deliverability of the site?	The landowner intention to develop part of the site will need to be confirmed (see question 27 of the Detailed Appraisal below and the link to Map 014A on the Candidate Site Register). Access arrangements to the remainder of the agricultural field will also require further clarification to fully assess the appropriateness of the site.	No
С	Does the site have a planning history?		No history
D	Is the site compatible with the Preferred Strategy of the Replacement Local Development Plan?	The amended site is considered appropriate for allocation of 8 units (see link to Map 014A on the Candidate Site Register).	Yes

Section 2 – Detailed Site Appraisal

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
1	Is the site within or adjoining an existing Centre?		Adjoining edge of Centre
2	Is the site located on previously developed (brownfield) land, as defined by Planning Policy Wales (figure 4.1)		Greenfield
3	Would the development of the site result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		Grade 3a
4	Is the site accessible from a public highway?	Improvements will be required to the existing agricultural access.	Yes – with improvements
5	Is the nearby highway network capable of accommodating the resulting traffic movements?	No objection in principle from the Highways Authority.	Yes
6	Is public transport available?		Yes – more than 5 buses/trains per day
7	Would the development of the site result in the loss of publicly accessible open space?		Would not result in a loss
8	Is the site within 100m of existing water, sewerage, electrical, gas and telecommunications systems?		Yes
9	Is there a possible infrastructure capacity issue that could act as a constraint to development?	Dwr Cymru has indicated that foul sewage capacity exists for the proposed site.	No
10	If the site is proposed for residential development, how does it relate to any employment uses adjacent to the site?		Not close to employment uses

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
11	If the site is proposed for 'bad neighbour' development – ie employment are there any residential properties within 400m of the site?		N/A
12	Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at an international level?		No
13	Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a national level?		No
14	Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a local level?		No
15	Is the site within or adjacent to a Regionally Important Geodiversity Site?		No
16	What is the outcome of the biodiversity assessment (if applicable ¹)?	No major ecological issues likely.	Positive
17	Is there are threat to mature trees or hedgerows within or adjacent to the site?		No
18	Is the development of the site likely to affect the habitat, breeding site or resting place of a protected species?		No

¹ This appraisal will be undertaken for sites which are considered suitable for inclusion in the Plan only.

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
19	Is the site located within or close to a designated open space?		No
20	Is the site located within or close to an area designated for cultural heritage importance?		No
21	Is the site within or adjacent to a Conservation Area?		No
22	Are there any Listed Buildings within or adjacent to the site?		No
23	Are there any Scheduled Ancient Monuments within or adjacent to the site?		No
24	Is the site located within or adjacent to an area prone to flood risk?		No
25	If the site is within or adjacent to an area prone to flooding is the risk acceptable, having regards to vulnerability of the development proposed.		N/A
26	Do the topographical characteristics of the site present an obstacle to development?		No

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
27	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on the character of the Centre or locality?	This site forms part of an agricultural field within the heart of Square and Compass, opposite the filling station to the south and fronts onto the main A487 road. Residential development neighbours the site to the east and west, with open rolling countryside leading down to the coast to the north. Strong boundary hedgerow runs adjacent the A487.	
		The area proposed extends beyond the existing rear curtilages and built elements of neighbouring properties and as such development of the entire site would be likely to cause an unacceptable and illogical extension of the Centre into open countryside.	
		However the area from the A487 up to the existing rear (northern) boundary of the neighbouring Glasfryn residential property (to the west of the site) would consolidate an existing linear built character and remain in keeping with the existing rear Centre edge (see link to Map 014A in the Candidate Site Register).	Yes but can be mitigated
		New hedgerow can be created to consolidate the rear boundary and contain development to the north. Development of this site would need to remain in keeping with the linear character of Square and Compass and maintain a degree of porosity when viewed from the A487, to maintain the constant intermittent views of the coastal headland to the north from within the Centre, which provides an attractive backdrop and contributes to the overall character of the Centre.	
28	Is there evidence that the site could consist of potentially contaminated land?		No

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
29	Is the site within a minerals safeguarding zone?		No
30	Is the land likely to be adversely affected by stability issues?		No

Overall Assessment:

The site is submitted for housing. It forms part of an agricultural field within the heart of Square and Compass, opposite the filling station to the south and fronts onto the main A487 road. The area proposed extends beyond the existing rear curtilages and built elements of neighbouring properties and as such development of the entire site would be likely to cause an unacceptable and illogical extension of the Centre into open countryside. However the area from the A487 up to the existing rear (northern) boundary of the neighbouring Glasfryn residential property (to the west of the site) would consolidate an existing linear built character and remain in keeping with the existing rear Centre edge (see link to Map 014A in the Candidate Site Register).

The proposal, as amended, is considered to comply with the revised Preferred Strategy and would be appropriate for allocation within the replacement Local Development Plan for 8 units. The Land Implementation Study indicates that the site will be financially viable for affordable housing provision.

Recommendation			
Compliant with the draft Preferred Strategy	Yes	Further information required	No

Site Location	Land adjacent to Bryngolau, Square and
	Compass
Community	Llanrhian
Site Number	106
Representor Number	4474
Proposed Use	Housing

Candidate Site Assessment

Section 1 – Key Questions

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
A	Is the site compatible with the National Park Purposes and Duty?	Development of the site is considered to be compatible (see question 27 of the Detailed Appraisal below)	Yes
В	Is there evidence to question the viability or deliverability of the site?		No
С	Does the site have a planning history?		No history
D	Is the site compatible with the Preferred Strategy of the Replacement Local Development Plan?	Site is located in a sustainable location adjacent the existing Centre boundary of Square and Compass (see Overall Assessment below).	Yes

Section 2 – Detailed Site Appraisal

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
1	Is the site within or adjoining an existing Centre?		Adjoining edge of Centre

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
2	Is the site located on previously developed (brownfield) land, as defined by Planning Policy Wales (figure 4.1)		Greenfield
3	Would the development of the site result in the loss of	Unknown.	No loss
	the best and most versatile agricultural land?		Grade 3a and above
			Grade 1 or 2
4	Is the site accessible from a public highway?	Improvements will be required to the existing agricultural access.	Yes with improvements.
5	Is the nearby highway network capable of accommodating the resulting traffic movements?	No objection in principle from the Highways Authority.	Yes
6	Is public transport available?		Yes – more than 5 buses/trains per day
7	Would the development of the site result in the loss of publicly accessible open space?		Would not result in a loss
8	Is the site within 100m of existing water, sewerage, electrical, gas and telecommunications systems?		Yes
9	Is there a possible infrastructure capacity issue that could act as a constraint to development?	Dwr Cymru has indicated that foul sewage capacity exists for the proposed site.	No
10	If the site is proposed for residential development, how does it relate to any employment uses adjacent to the site?		Not close to employment uses

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
11	If the site is proposed for 'bad neighbour' development – ie employment are there any residential properties within 400m of the site?		N/A
12	Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at an international level?		No
13	Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a national level?		No
14	Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a local level?		No
15	Is the site within or adjacent to a Regionally Important Geodiversity Site?		No
16	What is the outcome of the biodiversity assessment (if		Positive
	applicable ¹)?		Neutral
17	Is there are threat to mature		Negative
	trees or hedgerows within or adjacent to the site?		No
18	Is the development of the site likely to affect the	Further survey work required.	No
	habitat, breeding site or resting place of a protected		Potentially
	species?		Yes

¹ This appraisal will be undertaken for sites which are considered suitable for inclusion in the Plan only.

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
19	Is the site located within or close to a designated open space?		No
20	Is the site located within or close to an area designated for cultural heritage importance?		No
21	Is the site within or adjacent to a Conservation Area?		No
22	Are there any Listed Buildings within or adjacent to the site?		No
23	Are there any Scheduled Ancient Monuments within or adjacent to the site?		No
24	Is the site located within or adjacent to an area prone to flood risk?		No
25	If the site is within or adjacent to an area prone to flooding is the risk acceptable, having regards to vulnerability of the development proposed.		N/A
26	Do the topographical characteristics of the site present an obstacle to development?		No

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
27	Criterion Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on the character of the Centre or locality?	This site forms part of an agricultural field within the heart of Square and Compass and fronts onto the main A487 road. Residential development neighbours the site to the east and west, with an agricultural holding and residential properties to the south across the road. Open rolling countryside leads down to the coast to the north. Strong boundary hedgerow runs adjacent the A487. The site represents an infill opportunity that would consolidate and strengthen the existing linear character of Square and Compass without creating additional ribboning or intersecting key views. The rear northern boundary also remains consistent with the existing building line and centre boundary edge. New hedgerow can be created to consolidate the rear boundary and contain development to the north. The site is considered appropriate for up to 10 dwellings based on a 30 unit per hectare density. A public right of way (PROW) runs along the western boundary leading northwards out of the Centre towards coastal headland. Whilst development of the site would introduce a more prominent residential character to this section of the PROW, it is not considered to	Assessment Criteria
		cause an unacceptable detrimental impact upon its amenity value, in respect of its already strong physical relationship with the existing Centre with a busy road and neighbouring residential development. A green buffer can be maintained to further reduce the impact of development. Access to the remainder of the agricultural field will require further detail and subsequent consideration.	
27	Is there evidence that the site could consist of potentially contaminated land?		No

	Criterion	Commentary	Assessment Criteria
28	Is the site within a minerals safeguarding zone?		No
29	Is the land likely to be adversely affected by stability issues?		No

Overall Assessment:

This site is proposed for housing that represents an infill opportunity that would consolidate and strengthen the existing linear character of Square and Compass without creating additional ribboning or intersecting key views.

Additional information has been submitted in relation to affordable housing viability which will require further consideration. A public right of way (PROW) runs along the western boundary leading northwards out of the Centre towards coastal headland. Whilst development of the site would introduce a more prominent residential character to this section of the PROW, it is not considered to cause an unacceptable detrimental impact upon its amenity value, in respect of its already strong physical relationship with the existing Centre with a busy road and neighbouring residential development. The site is considered appropriate for up to 10 dwellings based on a 30 unit per hectare density. Additional information has been submitted in relation to affordable housing viability which will require further consideration.

Further information required:

- Detail of subsequent access arrangements for the remainder of the agricultural field. Post development.
- Further assessment of financial viability to confirm on site affordable housing provision.

Recommendation			
Compliant with the draft Preferred Strategy	Yes	Further information required	No