

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL



MONMOUTHSHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Candidate Site Assessment Process and Criteria
Report of Consultation

April 2009

Candidate Site Assessment Process and Criteria Report of Consultation - April 2009

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="2"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="4"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Councillor Douglas Edwards"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="Monmouthshire County Council"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Candidate Site between Pentre Road and Pentre Lane, Abergavenny"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Objects to the candidate site between Pentre Road and Pentre Lane, forms a natural boundary between Abergavenny Town Centre and the National Park."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="No change requested."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	6
<i>Representation Number</i>	8
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Wyelands Estate
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Wyelands Estate
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 3
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Concerned that site CS/0076 has been grouped with CS/0159, believe it is premature to group individual sites before any assessment of individual sites has been undertaken. Argue that the site has a stronger physical and strategic relationship with CS/0214 adjoining to the east. The candidate site submission included a number of options such as the development of the whole site or development that adjoins CS/0214 to the east whilst retaining a gap to Pwllmeyric.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Suggest CS/0076 should be considered separately or with CS/0214 rather than with CS/0159.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, that CS/0076 should be considered separately from CS/0159 due to its size. It is however considered appropriate to keep this site separate from CS/0214.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Remove CS/0159 from the list of Strategic Candidate Sites.

Respondent Number

6

Representation Number

9

Respondent Name

Wyelands Estate

Respondent Organisation

Wyelands Estate

Subject

Appendix 4- Criteria 1

Summary of Representation

Suggest that Criteria 1 is too simplistic, there should be a greater reference to the distance to key settlements.

Requested Change

Change to reflect comment above.

Summary of LPA Response

Disagree that Criteria 1 should give reference to the distance to key settlements. The main purpose of this criterion is to determine the broad location of the site in relation to sustainable settlements.

Recommendation

No change in respect of this representation. However, the text in the ratings for Criteria 1 should be changed to 'within main settlement' in the green rating and 'adjoining edge of main settlement' in the amber rating.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	6
<i>Representation Number</i>	10
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Wyelands Estate
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Wyelands Estate
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criterion 4
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Recommend the scoring system for Criteria 4 should be changed so that there is a 'strategic access' score in addition to a yes/no score. This would reveal sites with good access to the strategic networks or rail, trunk roads and motorways.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Add a strategic access score to Criteria 4.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Disagree, it is not considered appropriate to add strategic access to criterion 4, access to public transport is already covered by criterion 6. Good access to motorways is likely to encourage commuting by the private motor car and is not necessarily appropriate from a sustainability point of view.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="7"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="7"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Rose Freeman"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="The Theatres Trust"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Candidate Sites Assessment Process and Criteria"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="No comment to make, but look forward to being consulted on all further LDP documents in due course."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="No change requested."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comments noted, no reply necessary."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

Respondent Number

8

Representation Number

13

Respondent Name

Bovis Homes

Respondent Organisation

Bovis Homes

Subject

Paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4

Summary of Representation

Concern regarding references to 'main towns' in paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4. Suggest that Abergavenny, Caldicot, Chepstow, Magor/Undy, Monmouth and Usk should be identified in this text.

Requested Change

Include Abergavenny, Caldicot, Chepstow, Magor/Undy, Monmouth and Usk in the references in paragraph 3.3 and 3.4.

Summary of LPA Response

Agree that the text should be amended in paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 from main towns to reflect the terminology used in the Options Report, which refers to main settlements . It is not considered necessary to name the individual settlements in these paragraphs.

Recommendation

The text will be changed in paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 from 'main towns' to 'main settlements'. Criterion 1 in Appendix 4 will also be changed to 'main settlements' rather than main towns.

Respondent Number	8
Representation Number	14
Respondent Name	Bovis Homes
Respondent Organisation	Bovis Homes
Subject	Appendix 4- Criteria 11-13
Summary of Representation	Concern regarding the key elements of the table, the traffic light system has its benefits but limits to only 3 possible categories. Criteria 11-13 reflects the issue of having to pool answers rather than fitting the system around the possible answers. A distinction should be made between local and national, it is inappropriate to assess under the same criteria. There is a fundamental difference between being within a designation as opposed to adjoining a designation.
Requested Change	Need to separate Criteria 11-13.
Summary of LPA Response	Agree, criteria 11 and 12 should be separated for each level of designation. Criteria 13 should be amended to clarify which designated sites are being referred to.
Recommendation	<p>Criteria 11 will be separated and amended into three categories, renumbered to Criteria 13a, 13b and 13c.</p> <p>Criteria 12 will be split into two categories and will be renumbered to criteria 15a and 15b.</p> <p>Criteria 13 will be amended in response to comments made by GGAT in representation 25.2 to 'Is the site located within or close to an area designated of cultural heritage importance? eg. Areas of Special Archaeological Sensitivity, Historic Parks and Gardens, Historic Landscapes and Blaenavon World Heritage Site' (Now renumbered as Criteria 17).</p> <p>The ratings of all will be amended to 'no' in the green box, 'adjacent/close to' in the amber box and 'within' in the red box.</p>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	8
<i>Representation Number</i>	15
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Bovis Homes
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Bovis Homes
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criteria 4-8
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Concern relating specifically to Criteria 4-8, the scale of each site needs to be considered. A number of sites may attract a red rating as a result of the wording, however, some given their scale could comfortably provide the critical mass to not only serve the development but also improve the existing facilities. The nature of the scoring system will result in people being drawn to red ratings which is therefore negative.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Suggest adding a traffic light column to ascertain whether the site is of a sufficient size to provide the critical mass to secure such facilities.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however, it is considered that the deliverability criteria in appendix 5 will ensure this is assessed.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

Respondent Number

8

Representation Number

16

Respondent Name

Bovis Homes

Respondent Organisation

Bovis Homes

Subject

Appendix 4- Criteria 10

Summary of Representation

If employment is proposed within 400m of residential properties it will attract a red rating, contradicting with criteria 9. This does not comply with mixed use policy and the need to reduce reliance on the private car.

Requested Change

The criteria should be reworded to specifically refer to 'bad neighbour' employment uses.

Summary of LPA Response

Agree, the criteria should be changed to include the wording 'bad neighbour' prior to employment in order not to conflict with criteria 9.

Recommendation

Add 'bad neighbour' before employment to criteria 10 (now renumbered as criteria 12).

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="11"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="National Grid"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="White Young Green Planning and Design"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Candidate Sites Assessment Process and Criteria"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="National Grid does not wish to make any specific representation at this time, but would be most grateful if they would be consulted on all future planning policy documents."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="No change requested."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comments noted, no reply necessary."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

Respondent Number

16

Representation Number

5

Respondent Name

Gwent Healthcare NHS Trust

Respondent Organisation

Gwent Healthcare NHS Trust

Subject

Appendix 4- Criterion 4

Summary of Representation

Recommend the scoring system for Criteria 4 should be changed so that there is a 'strategic access' score in addition to a yes/no score. This would reveal sites with good access to the strategic networks or rail, trunk roads and motorways.

Requested Change

Add a strategic access score to Criteria 4.

Summary of LPA Response

Criteria 4 should be amended to omit 'appropriate' from the text. An additional amber assessment rating should be added stating 'Yes, however requires improvements'. It is not however considered appropriate to add strategic access to criteria 4 as this is already covered by other criteria.

Recommendation

Omit 'appropriate' from the text in Criteria 4. Add an additional amber rating stating 'Yes, however requires improvements'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	18
<i>Representation Number</i>	13
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Wynddel Property Management Ltd
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Wynddel Property Management Ltd
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criteria 11 and 12
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	With regard to Criteria 11 and 12, there is a fundamental difference between being within a designation or adjoining a national designation, criteria 11-13 should be separated into three, local, national and international.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Separate criteria 11-13 into local, national and international.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, criteria 11 and 12 should be separated for each level of designation. Criteria 13 should be amended to clarify which designated sites are being referred to.
<i>Recommendation</i>	<p>Criteria 11 will be separated and amended into three categories, renumbered to Criteria 13a, 13b and 13c.</p> <p>Criteria 12 will be split into two categories and will be renumbered to criteria 15a and 15b.</p> <p>Criteria 13 will be amended in response to comments made by GGAT in representation 25.2 to 'Is the site located within or close to an area designated of cultural heritage importance? eg. Areas of Special Archaeological Sensitivity, Historic Parks and Gardens, Historic Landscapes and Blaenavon World Heritage Site' (Now renumbered as Criteria 17).</p> <p>The ratings of all will be amended to 'no' in the green box, 'adjacent/close to' in the amber box and 'within' in the red box.</p>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	18
<i>Representation Number</i>	14
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Wynddel Property Management Ltd
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Wynddel Property Management Ltd
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criteria 14
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Consider that Criteria 14 is too loosely defined. Many sites within Conservation Areas are derelict and of poor visual quality, development would present an opportunity to improve the setting of these areas.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Suggest that the criteria be altered to identify whether a site lies adjacent to a listed building rather than within or adjacent a conservation area.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, the criteria will be amended and split into three separate designations, conservation area, listed buildings and also scheduled ancient monuments. The ratings will be amended to 'no' in the green box, 'adjacent/close to' in the amber box and 'within' in the red box.
<i>Recommendation</i>	<p>Criteria 14 will be amended and split into three separate criteria. These will be renumbered to criteria 18 which will state 'Is the site within or adjacent a Conservation area to the extent that the setting would be affected'.</p> <p>Criteria 19 will state 'Are there any listed buildings within or adjacent the site where the development would be to the extent that its setting would be affected?'</p> <p>Criteria 20 will state 'Are there any Scheduled Ancient Monuments within or adjacent the site to the extent that its setting would be affected'.</p> <p>The ratings of all will be amended to 'no' in the green box, 'adjacent/close to' in the amber box and 'within' in the red box.</p>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	18
<i>Representation Number</i>	15
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Wynddel Property Management Ltd
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Wynddel Property Management Ltd
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criteria 17
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Propose Criteria 17 be deleted. The remediation of contaminated sites will be of a positive benefit to local communities.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Delete Criteria 17.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Disagree that criteria 17 should be deleted. An amber rating should be added instead stating 'Yes, but capable of remediation' and the red rating should be amended to state 'Yes, however unlikely to be capable of remediation'.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Add an amber rating to Criteria 23 (renumbered from 17) stating 'Yes, but capable of remediation' and the red rating should be amended to state 'Yes, however unlikely to be capable of remediation'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	21
<i>Representation Number</i>	3
<i>Respondent Name</i>	David Calver
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Barnets Wood Area Neighbourhood Watch/Residents Association
<i>Subject</i>	Chepstow candidate sites
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Concerns of three candidate sites: Greenfield land north of the Bayfield Estate, Greenfield land between the Bayfield Estate and the A48, Land extending north east of Pwllmeyric, north of the A48. The utility services in Chepstow are not believed to be fit for purpose and need urgent redesign. There are insufficient places in the local primary schools.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

Respondent Number

25

Representation Number

5

Respondent Name

Neil Maylan

Respondent Organisation

Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Limited

Subject

Page 4 Environmental Factors

Summary of Representation

Page 4- environmental factors, suggest that the historic environment should be added and that Scheduled Ancient monuments be added to the list.

Requested Change

Change to reflect comments made.

Summary of LPA Response

Agree, a reference to 'impact on historic environment' should be added to the first bullet point beneath environmental factors. A criterion will be added relating specifically to Scheduled Ancient Monuments in Appendix 4.

Recommendation

Add a reference to 'impact on historic environment' to the first bullet point beneath environmental factors. Add an additional criterion to Appendix 4 relating to Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	25
<i>Representation Number</i>	6
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Neil Maylan
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust Limited
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criterion 13
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	The assessment criteria relating to Criterion 13 do not provide a straight answer, should either be yes or no. Suggest this should be changed to 'is the site located within or close to an area designated of cultural heritage importance' in order to make the assessment criteria an appropriate response.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, the criterion should be changed.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Amend criterion 13 (renumbered to 17) to 'Is the site located within or close to an area designated of cultural heritage importance? eg. Areas of Special Archaeological Sensitivity, Historic Parks and Gardens, Historic Landscapes and Blaenavon World Heritage Site'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	27
<i>Representation Number</i>	9
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Richard Jones
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Countryside Council for Wales
<i>Subject</i>	Section 3
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	The proposed use of a traffic light system to assess candidate sites is noted. The only concern in using this approach is that it may not capture the nature of the effect eg. the development of a particular site may have positive benefits for certain criterion. Therefore it should be included in the comments section of the appraisal schedule.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comments noted, however this system is preferred to a scoring system because it enables conflicting ratings to be identified. These will be included in the comments section of the appraisal.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

Respondent Number

27

Representation Number

10

Respondent Name

Richard Jones

Respondent Organisation

Countryside Council for Wales

Subject

Environmental Factors

Summary of Representation

Under the environmental section, there needs to be a question on biodiversity, similar to the landscape question.

Requested Change

Change to reflect comments made.

Summary of LPA Response

Comment noted, it is considered that no change should be made to the existing biodiversity question. The table in Appendix 4 will be amended to include additional criteria relating to biodiversity.

Recommendation

No change in respect of this representation.

Respondent Number

27

Representation Number

11

Respondent Name

Richard Jones

Respondent Organisation

Countryside Council for Wales

Subject

Appendix 4- Criterion 11

Summary of Representation

Would prefer to see a separate criterion on protected species, recommend the following wording 'Is the site likely to affect the habitat, breeding site or resting place of a protected species'

Requested Change

Add an additional criterion with the following wording 'Is the site likely to affect the habitat, breeding site or resting place of a protected species'.

Summary of LPA Response

Agree, this should be added as an additional criterion, with a green rating as 'no', amber 'potentially' and red 'yes'.

Recommendation

Add an additional criterion (number 14) with the following wording: 'Is the site likely to affect the habitat, breeding site or resting place of a protected species'. The green rating of 'no', amber rating as 'potentially' and red rating of 'yes'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	27
<i>Representation Number</i>	12
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Richard Jones
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Countryside Council for Wales
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criterion 11
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Need to make a distinction between species protected by international legislation, national legislation, UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and Local (BAP).
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, this criterion should be split into three separate criterion relating to international, national and local biodiversity importance.
<i>Recommendation</i>	<p>Split criterion 11 into three new criterion 13a: 'Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at an International level', 13b 'Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a national level' and 13c 'Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a local level' (after renumbering)</p> <p>The green rating should be reworded to 'no', the amber rating to 'adjacent/close to' and the red rating to 'within'.</p>

Respondent Number

27

Representation Number

13

Respondent Name

Richard Jones

Respondent Organisation

Countryside Council for Wales

Subject

Appendix 4- Criterion 12

Summary of Representation

Criterion 12 is biased towards designations and does not take into account a range of other landscape considerations eg. effect on ancient semi-natural woodland or individual trees/hedgerows of landscape importance.

Requested Change

Change to reflect comments made.

Summary of LPA Response

Agree, a separate criteria should be added relating to the landscape sensitivity and capacity of the site.

Recommendation

Add the following two criterion:

16a 'What is the landscape sensitivity of the site ie. how susceptible are the key characteristics of the site to change and what is the value of it as a landscape resource? (eg field patterns, woodland)

16b 'What is the landscape capacity of the site ie. what is the limit for acceptable change and the ability of the site to accommodate development'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	27
<i>Representation Number</i>	14
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Richard Jones
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Countryside Council for Wales
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	There is no criterion to assess candidate sites against their effects on public access and public amenity including accessible natural green space. Feel an additional criterion should be included for these aspects.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, an additional criterion should be added stating 'would the development of the site result in the loss of publicly accessible open space or have an effect on the public access networks'.
<i>Recommendation</i>	<p>Add the following as criterion 9 'would the development of the site result in the loss of publicly accessible open space or have an effect on the public access networks'.</p> <p>The green rating will state 'would not result in a loss', the amber rating 'would effect public access, however any impact could be mitigated against' and the red rating 'would result in a loss/unacceptably effect public access'.</p>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	32
<i>Representation Number</i>	20
<i>Respondent Name</i>	St Regis Paper Company Ltd.
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	St Regis Paper Company Ltd
<i>Subject</i>	Methodology
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	The methodology does not clearly set out what involvement site promoters will have in the process, particularly during the initial assessment stage. There may be information available to demonstrate how site constraints can be potentially mitigated. Landowners may already have information which could inform the assessment.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, it should be stated that site promoters will be given the opportunity to provide additional supporting information prior to the Deposit Plan, including information relating to those matters referred to in Appendix 5 in paragraph 3.8. Paragraph 5.3 should also be amended.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Amend paragraphs 3.8 and 5.3 to include references to the involvement of developers and landowners.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="32"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="21"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="St Regis Paper Company Ltd."/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="St Regis Paper Company Ltd"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Translation into the Preferred Strategy"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="No detailed advice is provided on how a sites rating using the traffic light system will be translated into th Preferred Strategy as sites are taken forward into the LDP. What is the mechanism behind the 'balancing process'."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comments made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Agree, paragraph 3.8 should be amended to provide further details on the justification of the inclusion of sites within the Preferred Strategy."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="Paragraph 3.8 will be amended to provide more detail."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	32
<i>Representation Number</i>	22
<i>Respondent Name</i>	St Regis Paper Company Ltd.
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	St Regis Paper Company Ltd
<i>Subject</i>	Publication of results of site assessment process.
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	It should be clarified whether the results of the site assessment process will be formally published to give promoters an opportunity to submit further details in connection with their sites.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, the results of the assessments for the Strategic Candidate Sites will be published as supporting information to the Preferred Strategy.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Publish results of the assessment of the Strategic Candidate Sites as supporting information to the Preferred Strategy.

Respondent Number

32

Representation Number

23

Respondent Name

St Regis Paper Company Ltd.

Respondent Organisation

St Regis Paper Company Ltd

Subject

Appendix 4- Criterion 3

Summary of Representation

Criterion 3 relates to the impact of a sites development on agricultural land, but doesn't allow for those sites that do not result in loss of agricultural land.

Requested Change

Suggest a green light is added for these instances.

Summary of LPA Response

Agree, a green indicator should be added with the following wording 'does not result in the loss of agricultural land'. The other ratings will also be changed in response to comments raised by Hunter Page Planning (rep 113.11) to 'grade 3 and above' for the amber rating and 'grade 1/2' in the red rating.

Recommendation

Add an additional green rating to Criterion 3 with the following wording 'does not result in the loss of agricultural land'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	32
<i>Representation Number</i>	24
<i>Respondent Name</i>	St Regis Paper Company Ltd.
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	St Regis Paper Company Ltd
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criterion 4
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Criterion 4 relates to whether appropriate vehicular access is available to and from a main public highway- no explanation is provided as to what would be considered as appropriate.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, the word appropriate should be deleted from the text. An additional amber rating should also be added with the following wording 'Yes, however requires improvements'.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Delete 'appropriate' from the text of Criterion 4 and add an additional amber rating with the following wording 'Yes, however requires improvements'.

Respondent Number	32
Representation Number	25
Respondent Name	St Regis Paper Company Ltd.
Respondent Organisation	St Regis Paper Company Ltd
Subject	
Summary of Representation	A number of criteria relate to potential site constraints. As a number are significantly larger than the 8ha threshold they could offer the ability to overcome potential constraints through appropriate mitigation. This relates in particular to criteria 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 17. As an example the amber light could also be adjusted in criterion 15 to adjacent/partially within.
Requested Change	Change to reflect comments made.
Summary of LPA Response	Agree that the amber rating in Criterion 15 should be amended to 'adjacent/partially within', the question should also be amended omitting the reference to 'adjacent a watercourse'. The other Criterion and ratings will be amended with regard to this and numerous other comments.
Recommendation	Amend the amber rating in Criterion 15 to 'adjacent/partially within'. Amend the question to 'Is the site located within or adjacent an area prone to flood risk' in the question. Amend Criterion 11, 12, 13, 14 and 17 and the associated ratings.

Respondent Number	32
Representation Number	26
Respondent Name	St Regis Paper Company Ltd.
Respondent Organisation	St Regis Paper Company Ltd
Subject	
Summary of Representation	Criterion 17 relates to contamination. Brownfield developments have potential for contamination by their nature. Whilst a site could score positively for brownfield this criterion effectively scores negatively, this is an instance where clarity is needed on how the criterion will be balanced.
Requested Change	Change to reflect comments made.
Summary of LPA Response	Agree, the wording of the question should include 'potential', the red rating should be amended to state 'Yes, however unlikely to be capable of remediation'. An amber rating should also be added stating 'Yes, however capable of remediation'.
Recommendation	Amend the question to 'Is there evidence that the site could consist of potentially contaminated land?'. Add an additional amber rating stating 'Yes, however capable of remediation' and amend the red rating to 'Yes, however unlikely to be capable of remediation'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="45"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="2"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Stephen Staines"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="FFT Planning"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="General response"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="General response regarding planning for gypsies and travellers."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="No change requested."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="48"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="2"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Peter Charles-Greed"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="CS/0049"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Refers to CS/0049 a proposed mixed development site. Gives further information regarding the proposed layout and access to the candidate site."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="No change requested."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	64
<i>Representation Number</i>	2
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Dick Cole
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	Other emerging potential sites
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Would like to know when other emerging potential sites will be assessed and expects them to be made public.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, the results will be published as supporting information to the Preferred Strategy.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Publish results of the assessment of the Strategic Candidate Sites as supporting information to the Preferred Strategy.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	64
<i>Representation Number</i>	3
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Dick Cole
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Presumes the potential of sites in relation to the overall LDP strategy will be assessed after this is established.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Non-strategic sites that are compatible with the Preferred Strategy criteria (as stated in paragraph 6.3) as part of the preparation of the Deposit LDP.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="64"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="4"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Dick Cole"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Weighting of assessments"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Accepts the traffic light system but suggests each criterion should be given a weighting factor to assist evaluation."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comments made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, this system is preferred to a scoring system because it enables conflicting ratings to be identified. These will then be included in the comments section of the appraisal which will assist evaluation."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="64"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="5"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Dick Cole"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Appendix 4- Criterion 5"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Need to define 'regular frequent' in Criterion 5, 'at least hourly' is suggested."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comments made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, it is not considered appropriate to change the wording to 'at least hourly' however the wording should be amended to provide clarification."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="Amend criterion 5 (renumbered to criterion 6) to the following wording 'Is the site located within 400m or 800m of an access point to regular (at least 5 services between 7am-7pm Monday-Saturday) public transport, eg. a bus stop or train station?'."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="64"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Dick Cole"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Appendix 5"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Would like clarification on whether the relationship with neighbouring sites and settlement/area as a whole is the same as page 4, para 3.6 in Environmental Factors 'The impact on chatacter and appearance of the area, including the visual prominence of the site' If so prefers the latter wording."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comments made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="These are not the same, Appendix 5 is a combination of factors to assess the potential benefits/disbenefits to the area."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="64"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="7"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Dick Cole"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="The system"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Hopes the system allows sites to be split, where one part may rate more favourably than the remainder."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comments made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, the ratings throughout Appendix 4 will be amended in a number of areas to account for this. It will also be noted in the comments section of each criterion."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="65"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="2"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Messrs Fairfield Mabey"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="Messrs Fairfield Mabey"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Identification of the Strategic Sites"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Support the identification of the site as one of the Strategic Candidate Sites."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="No change requested."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comments Noted."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change necessary."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	84
<i>Representation Number</i>	2
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Glyn Parkhouse
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Transition Chepstow
<i>Subject</i>	Retention of CS/0103- Hwyl Dda MHU
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggest CS/0103 Hwyl Dda MHU be retained for future community use.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comment made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	84
<i>Representation Number</i>	3
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Glyn Parkhouse
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Transition Chepstow
<i>Subject</i>	CS/0214-Land at Mounton Road
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggest CS/0214: Land at Mounton Road, Chepstow is rejected as it lies within a Green Wedge (currently under UDP Policy), prevents coalescence and clearly defines a boundary between the urban area and the countryside. It is also adjacent the AONB.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comment made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	84
<i>Representation Number</i>	4
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Glyn Parkhouse
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Transition Chepstow
<i>Subject</i>	CS/0231- Land to rear of St Annes Nursing Home
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggest CS/0231 is rejected as the site is adjacent the school and has potential as a food production area where children can learn horticultural techniques.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comment made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="84"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="5"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Glyn Parkhouse"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="Transition Chepstow"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="CS/0096- Land to the north of Bayfield"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="CS/0096- Land to the north of Bayfield. Transition Chepstow expect a detailed development brief which would indicate how land would be developed in a sustainable manner."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comment made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	84
<i>Representation Number</i>	6
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Glyn Parkhouse
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Transition Chepstow
<i>Subject</i>	CS/0190- Private Car Park, Dell View, Chepstow
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggest development at CS/0190- Private Car Park, Dell View, Chepstow must be extremely sensitive and adhere to sustainability principles etc.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comment made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="84"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="7"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Glyn Parkhouse"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="Transition Chepstow"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="CS/0193- Lower Chepstow"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Suggest CS/0193- Lower Chepstow should be a mixed use site. A detailed development brief or 'masterplan' should be required. Suggest Fairfield Mabey CS/0158 and CS/0193 Lower Chepstow should be viewed as one site."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comment made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="84"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="8"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Glyn Parkhouse"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="Transition Chepstow"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="CS/0102- Beaufort Park"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="General comment stating the site was rejected in the Urban Housing Potential study for residential use as the site is under development for mixed retail and business uses."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="No change requested."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	84
<i>Representation Number</i>	9
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Glyn Parkhouse
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Transition Chepstow
<i>Subject</i>	CS/0141- Newhouse Industrial Estate
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggest CS/0141 Newhouse Industrial Estate would be appropriate for teleworking or telecottage development.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comment made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="84"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="10"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Glyn Parkhouse"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="Transition Chepstow"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="CS/0142- Wye Valley Link Road"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Suggest CS/0142- Wye Valley Link road is not appropriate for a commercial hotel and office use. Oppose development in the green wedge, would conflict with the desire to protect agricultural land for future food security and production."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comment made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

Respondent Number

94

Representation Number

2

Respondent Name

Jane Carpenter

Respondent Organisation

Redrow Homes

Subject

Smaller sites as part of Strategic Sites

Summary of Representation

Opportunity to include smaller sites as part of the strategic sites that have been identified. For example the Redrow proposal at Ross Road, Mardy could be considered with the Maindiff Court proposal. There will need to be some synergy between these two sites in terms of service provision. There could also be some advantages to highway solutions by dealing with these two sites.

Requested Change

Change to reflect comments made.

Summary of LPA Response

Comments noted, however it is not considered appropriate to consider Ross Road with Maindiff Court Hospital, these sites are clearly physically separated and not of a 'strategic' nature.

Recommendation

No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	94
<i>Representation Number</i>	3
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Jane Carpenter
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Redrow Homes
<i>Subject</i>	Section 3
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	The list of criteria for site selection seems reasonable but rather negative. It doesn't assess sites as to what they could contribute to in a physical, social or environmental manner. Some sites will be able to provide benefits to the advantage of their location- thereby having a net improvement rather than a net reduction in quality. By way of example Redrow has land adjacent Deri Road.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comments noted, Appendix 5 includes criterion relating to the relationship with neighbouring sites and the settlement as a whole which incorporates an assessment of the potential benefits/disbenefits to the area.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	103
<i>Representation Number</i>	2
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Andrew Blake
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Wye Valley AONB Unit
<i>Subject</i>	Environmental Factors
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	There is no specific reference to the Wye Valley AONB in the Environmental factors section. Very careful consideration will need to be given to determine whether there are suitable alternative sites outside the AONB and whether benefits of development outweigh any detrimental impact on the natural beauty of the AONB.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comments noted, it is considered that a reference to landscape designations should be added to the text in section 3 of the report.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Amend the additional wording to the first bullet point under environmental factors 'on any areas designated of landscape importance'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	103
<i>Representation Number</i>	3
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Andrew Blake
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Wye Valley AONB Unit
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 3
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Note that no sites within the AONB are in the list of Strategic Candidate Sites. There are a number of other candidate sites in the AONB which will need to be fully assessed against policies and be subject to a sustainability appraisal.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, all Candidate Sites will be fully assessed against the assessment criteria and the Preferred Strategy.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="103"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="4"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Andrew Blake"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="Wye Valley AONB Unit"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Appendix 4"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Pleased to see landscape designations as one of the criteria for the sustainability appraisal."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="No change requested."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="103"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="5"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Andrew Blake"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="Wye Valley AONB Unit"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Appendix 4"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Welcome the inclusion of the issue of flood risk, which is an important issue for sites along the River Wye and its tributaries."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="No change requested."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	113
<i>Representation Number</i>	1
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Mr Allen Roberts
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	Identification of Sites of Potential Strategic Significance.
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggests the Candidate Site Assessment Process and Criteria is flawed and that policy is fundamental to environmental protection and sustainability. Suggests sites that do not require changes in policy be identified for immediate development.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Disagree, all sites should be assessed using the same process.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="113"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="2"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Mr Allen Roberts"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Identification of Sites of Potential Strategic Significance."/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Concern of over reliance of Strategic Candidate Sites- focus on site size without reference to sustainability of the settlement."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comments made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, the sustainability of the site within the settlement will be assessed as part of the assessment process."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="113"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Mr Allen Roberts"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Identification of Sites of Potential Strategic Significance."/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Concern that the strategic sites are located at strategically insignificant locations."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comment made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, the strategic sites have been selected by size at this stage."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	113
<i>Representation Number</i>	4
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Mr Allen Roberts
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	Identification of Sites of Potential Strategic Significance.
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Noted a SFCA has not yet been completed, believe sites where flood risk is identified as an issue should not be pursued until a SFCA is undertaken.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comment made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	The Stage 1 of the SFCA has been undertaken, this combined with the second stage of the SFCA (currently in draft form) will provide sufficient information to assess the Strategic Candidate Sites.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	113
<i>Representation Number</i>	5
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Mr Allen Roberts
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	Pre-Option Assessment of Strategic Sites
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	There is no criterion that deals with spatial sustainability of their location.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comment made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Disagree, it is not considered appropriate to add a criteria regarding the spatial sustainability of the Strategic Candidate Sites to Appendix 5. This will be assessed using the initial assessment of sites against sustainability criteria as set out in Appendix 4.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="113"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Mr Allen Roberts"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Pre-Option Assessment of Strategic Sites"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="The term in the assessment process 'visual amenity' is an inadequate term to describe a fundamental process and should include a rigorous landscape and visual impact assessment of such sites."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comment made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Disagree, it is not considered appropriate to amend this term. A landscape and visual assessment will be undertaken of each of the strategic sites to inform the process."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	113
<i>Representation Number</i>	7
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Mr Allen Roberts
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	Land to the east of Rockfield Road
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Believe this site is unsuitable for development. Have undertaken analysis which identifies problems with flood risk, potential impact on the neighbouring Conservation Area and valuable landscape contribution in terms of the character and setting of Monmouth made by this area.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

Respondent Number

113

Representation Number

8

Respondent Name

Mr Allen Roberts

Respondent Organisation

Subject

Land to the west of Rockfield housing estate

Summary of Representation

Believe this site is unsuitable for development. Have undertaken analysis which identifies problems with flood risk and impact on the Special Landscape Area.

Requested Change

Change to reflect comments made.

Summary of LPA Response

Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP.

Recommendation

No change in respect of this representation.

Respondent Number

113

Representation Number

9

Respondent Name

Mr Allen Roberts

Respondent Organisation

Subject

Appendix 4- Criterion 2

Summary of Representation

Criterion 2 does not anticipate sites that are both brownfield and greenfield. It is suggested that an amber criterion be added to cover this eventuality.

Requested Change

Add an amber rating for sites that are both brownfield and greenfield.

Summary of LPA Response

Agree, an amber rating should be added for sites that are part brownfield/part greenfield.

Recommendation

Add an amber rating to Criterion 2 with the following wording 'part brownfield/part greenfield'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	113
<i>Representation Number</i>	10
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Mr Allen Roberts
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criterion 2
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	With regard to Criterion 2, there needs to be consideration of current use in terms of brownfield sites, as this could prevent delivery.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however it is considered that this will be assessed through the pre-deposit assessment (renamed) of strategic sites as set out in Appendix 5.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

Respondent Number

113

Representation Number

11

Respondent Name

Mr Allen Roberts

Respondent Organisation

Subject

Appendix 4- Criterion 3

Summary of Representation

The reference to (in current or previous use) in Criterion 3 is superfluous, it will either be above or below Grade 3A irrespective of use.

Requested Change

Change to reflect comment made.

Summary of LPA Response

Agree, the ratings should be changed and a green rating should also be added to state that the development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land.

Recommendation

Amend the red rating to read 'Grade 1/2' and the amber rating to read 'Grade 3 and above'. Add an additional green rating with the following wording 'Does not result in loss of agricultural land'.

Respondent Number

113

Representation Number

12

Respondent Name

Mr Allen Roberts

Respondent Organisation

Subject

Appendix 4- Criterion 15

Summary of Representation

It is not clear in Criterion 15 if there is an assessment criterion to reflect 'adjacent a watercourse'.

Requested Change

Change to reflect comment made.

Summary of LPA Response

Comment noted. It is considered that this text be removed and the criterion state instead 'Is the site located within or adjacent an area prone to flood risk'. The amber rating should also be amended to state 'Partially within/adjacent'.

Recommendation

Amend the text in Criterion 15 to state 'Is the site located within or adjacent an area prone to flood risk'. The text in the amber rating should be reworded to 'Partially within/adjacent'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	113
<i>Representation Number</i>	13
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Mr Allen Roberts
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	Initial assessment of sites against sustainability criteria
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	There is no consideration of other highly important 'qualitative' assessments such as importance to character and setting of settlement.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comment made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, there are no questions directly relating to this, however Criterion 12 and 13 will be amended to 15a, 15b, and 17. An additional two criterion should also be added as 16a and 16b relating to landscape sensitivity and landscape capacity, a landscape assessment is currently being undertaken to inform these criterion.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Add two additional criterion (16a and 16b) relating to landscape sensitivity and landscape capacity.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	113
<i>Representation Number</i>	14
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Mr Allen Roberts
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	Potential strategic development at Monmouth
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggest Monmouths strategic development requirements should be delivered through a selection of smaller allocations.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comment made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments would need to be submitted as an objection to the Preferred Strategy of the LDP should a strategic site be identified in Monmouth.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	114
<i>Representation Number</i>	1
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Energy Savings Trust
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Energy Saving Trust
<i>Subject</i>	Potential for Renewable Energy
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggest the potential for renewable energy generation is considered, suggest further criteria be included on: renewable energy generation potential of a site, synergies that exist between adjacent sites and consideration of community/district heat/power schemes for mixed use developments.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, the potential for renewable energy generation should be taken into consideration. It is considered appropriate to add this within Appendix 5 to the Criterion relating to 'relationship with neighbouring sites and settlement/area as a whole' rather than as a question within the initial assessment of sites against sustainability criteria.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Add 'potential for renewable energy generation' to the text in the process box for 'Relationship with neighbouring sites and settlement/area as a whole' in Appendix 5.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	115
<i>Representation Number</i>	1
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Martin Fenn-Smith
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Lower Wye Valley Society
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 3
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Concerned with differentiating between sites that fall within the AONB and those that fall outside it. Note that the process steps are essentially: Identification of candidate sites, Gathering of further information, Evaluation against 17 sustainability criteria, Inclusion or otherwise in the LDP.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, the assessment criteria includes a question relating to whether the site is located within or close to an area designated of landscape importance at a national level and will therefore provide a marker relating to the AONB.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="115"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="2"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Martin Fenn-Smith"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text" value="Lower Wye Valley Society"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="Appendix 4- Criterion 12"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Only one Criterion relates to whether or not a site falls within the AONB. Believe the AONB requires a much greater degree of recognition."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comments made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="The AONB is important in landscape considerations, it is not considered appropriate to include any criterion relating specifically to only this designation. Criterion 12 should be split into three separate criterion relating to international, national and local designations."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>

<i>Respondent Number</i>	115
<i>Representation Number</i>	3
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Martin Fenn-Smith
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Lower Wye Valley Society
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggest further criteria should be included for sites within the AONB: 'can the proposed development within the AONB or its environs be achieved by alternative development in a bigger settlement outside the AONB' and 'what is the potential for the proposed development to be environmentally-neutral eg. to generate its own energy or heat'.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Add two additional criteria to reflect comments made above.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Disagree that a criterion should be added specifically relating to the AONB, there is a criterion relating to areas designated of landscape importance at the national level. Agree that reference should be made to renewable energy generation and will be added within Appendix 5.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	115
<i>Representation Number</i>	4
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Martin Fenn-Smith
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Lower Wye Valley Society
<i>Subject</i>	Paragraph 3.8
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Concerned that the detailed results of the assessment process be made public and open to review to ensure due weight is given to the environmental factors for sites within the AONB, especially as no information is provided on the weight given to the individual criteria in arriving at an overall judgement.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, the individual assessments of the Strategic Candidate Sites will be published as supporting information to the Preferred Strategy.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Publish results of the assessment of the Strategic Candidate Sites as supporting information to the Preferred Strategy.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	116
<i>Representation Number</i>	1
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Anna Maciag
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Lower Wye Valley Society
<i>Subject</i>	Stricter Criteria in the AONB
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Suggest stricter criteria should be applied within the AONB. Any new development in the AONB and its environs should be weighed against providing alternative building land in a bigger settlement such as Monmouth or Chepstow which will far more readily reach the criteria.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Disagree, it is not considered appropriate to add a criterion relating specifically to the AONB. There is a criterion that relates to areas designated of landscape importance at the national level.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	116
<i>Representation Number</i>	2
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Anna Maciag
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Lower Wye Valley Society
<i>Subject</i>	Environmental factors
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Environmental factors should include the possibility of properties to generate their own heat and also should be built without damaging habitats.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, reference should be made to renewable energy and will be added to Appendix 5. An additional criterion will also be added relating to whether the site is likely to affect habitats, breeding sites or resting places of protected species.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Add reference to 'potential for renewable energy generation' to Appendix 5. Add an additional criterion to Appendix 4 stating 'Is the site likely to affect the habitat, breeding site or resting place of a protected species'.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	116
<i>Representation Number</i>	3
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Anna Maciag
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Lower Wye Valley Society
<i>Subject</i>	Appendix 4- Criterion 12-14
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Criterion 12-14 are of paramount interest from the standpoint of development in the context of an AONB. There is no information on the weighting to be given to the various factors, a serious weakness that a red mark on an Environmental factor may or may not cause the site to be rejected.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comments noted, however this system is preferred to a scoring system because it enables conflicting ratings to be identified. These will be included in the comments section of the appraisal. Paragraph 3.8 should be amended to provide further details.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Paragraph 3.8 will be amended to provide more detail.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	117
<i>Representation Number</i>	1
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Jenny Jones
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	CS/0010 and CS/0011
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	CS/0010 and CS/0011 would fail to reach good criteria specifications under environmental factors, physical constraints and infrastructure capacity.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. These comments will be considered further in the next stage of the LDP.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	117
<i>Representation Number</i>	2
<i>Respondent Name</i>	Jenny Jones
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	
<i>Subject</i>	Publishing of detailed specifications
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Trust that detailed specifications for the criteria will be made available, especially weighting to factors of special importance within an AONB.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Agree, the individual assessments of the Strategic Candidate Sites will be published as supporting information to the Preferred Strategy.
<i>Recommendation</i>	Publish results of the assessment of the Strategic Candidate Sites as supporting information to the Preferred Strategy.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	118
<i>Representation Number</i>	1
<i>Respondent Name</i>	M J Woods
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	Mitchel Troy United Community Council
<i>Subject</i>	Candidate Site for affordable housing
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	Comment relating to potential candidate site for affordable housing, would like it to be included within the Candidate Site register.
<i>Requested Change</i>	Change to reflect comments made.
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	Comment noted, however this is not a matter that specifically relates to the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology. A letter and the appropriate forms have been sent to the respondent detailing how the site could be considered as a candidate site through addition to an addendum.
<i>Recommendation</i>	No change in respect of this representation.

<i>Respondent Number</i>	<input type="text" value="119"/>
<i>Representation Number</i>	<input type="text" value="1"/>
<i>Respondent Name</i>	<input type="text" value="Richard Brogden"/>
<i>Respondent Organisation</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Subject</i>	<input type="text" value="CS/0021"/>
<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<input type="text" value="Refer to CS/0021 a proposed employment site. Whilst the site itself doesn't exceed 8 hectares when considered in conjunction with the adjoining land the total area considered does. Suggest that with regard to the current strategic site assessment the land should be considered at this stage as part of the assessment process."/>
<i>Requested Change</i>	<input type="text" value="Change to reflect comments made."/>
<i>Summary of LPA Response</i>	<input type="text" value="Comment noted, it is not considered appropriate to add this site to the Strategic Candidate Sites, however the site will be fully assessed at a later stage of the process and discussed with Newport City Council if necessary."/>
<i>Recommendation</i>	<input type="text" value="No change in respect of this representation."/>