



Flintshire Local Development Plan  
May 2015

# Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology



# Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1   Introduction</b>  | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2   The Candidate Site Process</b>                          | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>3   Site Assessment Methodology</b>                         | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>4   What happens next</b>                                   | <b>13</b> |
| <b>5   How to comment on the Assessment Methodology</b>        | <b>14</b> |
| <b>6   Further Information and Advice</b>                      | <b>14</b> |
| <b>7   Appendices</b>  | <b>15</b> |
| <br>   |           |
| A. List of current settlements in the Unitary Development Plan | 15        |
| <br>   |           |
| B. Extract from Planning Policy Wales February 2014            | 17        |
| <br>   |           |
| C. Candidate Site Officer Assessment Form                      | 18        |
| <br>   |           |
| D. UDP allocations to be re-assessed                           | 23        |
| <br>   |           |
| E. Candidate Site Assessment Methodology Questionnaire         | 25        |

# 1 | Introduction:

**1.1** | This document sets out the preferred methodology and assessment process for the consideration of land for development in the emerging Local Development Plan (LDP). In doing so it identifies the guiding principles for establishing potential new site allocations consistent with national planning policy and sustainable development. The document will be used as part of the evidence base to support the Council's approach towards the inclusion or omission of sites for development in the LDP.

**1.2** | This methodology has also been developed to reflect guidance contained in Local Development Plans Wales 2005 (Welsh Assembly Government) which states that 'the identification of sites should be founded on a robust and credible assessment of the suitability and availability of land for particular uses or a mix of uses and the probability that it will be developed'.

**1.3** | The Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology is now being issued for public consultation between Monday 9th March and Monday 20th April 2015 to seek comments on the proposed methodology and associated criteria so that it can be agreed upon by key stakeholders/ interested parties and used in processing the Candidate Sites.

# 2 | The Candidate Site Process:

**2.1** | The Local Development Plan Manual (Welsh Assembly Government, 2006) recommends that local planning authorities engage with developers and landowners early in the process at the evidence gathering stage to gather information on potential development sites that may be included in the plan. The aim of this is to help with the council's consideration of suitable sites for inclusion in the LDP and avoid a substantial number of unidentified sites coming forward at the examination stage.

**2.2** | As part of preparing the LDP the Council invited landowners, developers, organisations and members of the public to put forward "Candidate Sites" for any use or reuse for inclusion in the Plan. A three month period for the submission of sites ran from 28th February 2014 to 30th May 2014. In excess of 700 submissions were received for a range of uses including residential, employment, recreational amongst others, as well as land to be protected from development.

**2.3** | From the outset the Council made it clear that the submission of sites should not be interpreted as a commitment to be included in the plan as they would need to meet a criterion based assessment as set out in an agreed methodology paper. It is also important to note that as the LDP is a new development plan, land currently allocated in the adopted UDP will not automatically be taken forward into the LDP. If such sites have not been submitted as Candidate Sites, then where necessary the Council will re-assess these alongside the Candidate Sites. In addition other sites identified by officers will where appropriate be run through the assessment process.

**2.4** | To evaluate whether or not land to be allocated in the LDP is capable of development and can positively contribute to the development strategy all Candidate Sites will be subject to an assessment process to determine their suitability.

**2.5** | In order to do this there will need to be an agreed methodology and set of criteria against which the Candidate Sites can be assessed. Therefore the proposed methodology set out in this document seeks to ensure that there is a clear, easily understood and objective assessment procedure which makes the process open and fair to all interested persons and organizations.

## 3 | Site Assessment Methodology:

**3.1** | This methodology aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the development potential of sites and information requested on the Candidate Site submission form will directly feed into the assessment process. The Council reserves the right to correct factual inaccuracies and to ask for any further information considered necessary to assess the site.

**3.2** | In broad terms the Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology will include criteria to filter out sites that are below a certain size, clearly contrary to national planning policy or are unsuitable due to the presence of constraints. In addition a common sense approach will be a guiding principle to site assessment/selection. For example a Candidate Site which proposes a new dwelling or residential estate which is totally isolated from existing settlements and supporting services is unlikely to be considered acceptable. However any small sites on the edge of settlements will be considered as part of a review of existing settlement boundaries.

**3.3** | The methodology will also need to have regards to the LDP Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal (SEA/SA) which will assist in measuring the extent to which the plan will achieve its objectives for sustainable development. Any sites which are likely to have a significant effect on a European site Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area or Ramsar Site and their supporting habitat must also be subject to an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations (HRA)

**3.4** | In the interests of producing a sound development plan and to meet Government guidance the assessment process is essentially designed to examine Candidate Sites for their suitability, availability and probability that they can be developed within the life time of the Plan. Deliverability – i.e. as to when in the Plan period development is likely to come forward is a key issue for both the Welsh Government and the County Council.

**3.5** | The sites that will be included in the assessment process can be categorized as follows:-

- Sites promoted by private landowners, their agents, public and private developers.
- Sites identified by Council officers as having development potential that had received past developer interest e.g as part of preparing the UDP or sites in Council ownership. In addition the Council has commissioned a range of studies such as an employment land review and others relating to the County Towns such as the Mold Opportunity Sites Study which will also feed into the Candidate Sites process.
- Undeveloped existing UDP allocations, e.g. residential, employment or commercial allocations that may or may not have planning permission.

**3.6** | Each site will be subject to an assessment process in order to determine its suitability for inclusion in the LDP. In each instance the type of use being proposed will be made clear. The same methodology will be applied to any additional sites which may emerge as a result of studies undertaken by, or on behalf of the Council, and those uncommitted and unimplemented sites allocated within the adopted UDP.

**3.7** | The Council is proposing a four stage process as a methodology for the assessment of Candidate sites. It will be used to identify land to be allocated for development in the plan and it will also be used to help identify the potential acceptability and contribution of small sites.

**3.8** | The four stages of the assessment are summarised as follows:

- Initial filtering of sites by size and proposed land use.
- Detailed appraisal of filtered sites.
- Assessment against the plans preferred strategy in terms of the level and distribution of growth and against the evidenced need for development.
- Assessment of sites against other studies e.g housing, retail or town centre opportunity sites together with the SEA/SA and HRA.

## **Stage 1 - Initial filtering of sites:**

**3.9** | It is not the purpose of the LDP to micro-manage development, therefore in terms of sites for new housing, the first stage of the assessment will be to determine whether a site is too small to be carried forward into the subsequent stages of the process. From the submitted candidate sites the LDP team will identify those which do not require a land allocation within the LDP. For the purposes of this the Council defines small sites as being 9 or less units. Large sites are considered to be capable of accommodating 10 units or more which equates to a site size of 0.3Ha or greater based on an indicative density of 30 dwellings per hectare. This reflects the methodology adopted in the Joint Housing Land Availability Study carried out by the Council. **Small sites will be dealt with in two ways depending on the location.**

1. Development of small sites within existing settlements can be considered through the development management (planning application) process. Flintshire's adopted Unitary Development Plan contains policies for considering planning applications on small or unallocated sites in its towns and villages. A list of settlements as identified in the UDP can be found in Appendix A. If a site is for a single dwelling in the open countryside for example an agricultural /forestry workers dwelling then these will not be the subject of a detailed assessment as this would also best take place through the development management process. The proposers of such small sites will also be able to seek to influence, through engagement and consultation processes, the policy framework in the Plan against which small site applications will be considered in the future.
2. Small sites adjacent or in close proximity to existing UDP settlement boundaries will be considered as part of a settlement boundary review, which will be undertaken as part of the Plan preparation process, to assess their suitability for inclusion within the settlement boundary. Ultimately if a site is not included an explanation will be provided as to why.

**3.10** | Whilst these small sites will not be carried forward as Candidate Sites potential allocations their details will be included on the Candidate Sites register.

## **Settlement Boundary Review:**

**3.11** | Settlement boundaries are lines drawn on an Ordnance Survey based map and are shown in the Council's Development Plan. It should be borne in mind that a settlement boundary is a key planning tool to be used purely for land use planning proposals and no correlation with other ways (e.g. ward or Community/Town Council boundaries) of considering what constitutes a town, village or settlement is implied by their definition in the LDP.

**3.12** | A settlement boundary is a primary mechanism through which development plans can manage development patterns in terms of its distribution and location. They fulfill strategic functions which are:-

- Defining an area within which development would normally be permitted subject to meeting other planning requirements;
- Promoting full and effective use of urban land by steering development to sustainable locations;
- Preventing inappropriate development in the countryside and avoiding ribbon development or a fragmented development pattern.

**3.13** | Given that the main purpose of settlement boundaries is to manage development it is proposed that the LDP will refer to them as Development Boundaries. However irrespective of what they are referred to they will ultimately perform the same planning functions.

**3.14** | To establish the suitability of land for inclusion within or exclusion from existing UDP settlement boundaries **it is proposed that the following criteria will be used when assessing small sites.**

- Preferred Plan strategy i.e. how much development is needed and where should it take place and whether the settlement is considered to represent a sustainable location to accommodate further development
- Inclusion of the site should represent a natural and logical extension to a settlement using firm and defensible boundaries such as walls, fences, hedgerows or roads
- Existing commitments (planning permissions already granted or allocations carried over from the UDP)
- Identification of new allocations
- Constraints such as Conservation Areas, listed buildings, lack of suitable access, flooding or nature conservation interests
- Brownfield sites should be included where they abut a settlement unless they have insurmountable constraints e.g. the site is contaminated land or is in close proximity to a landfill site
- Development of the site would not represent an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside, ribbon development, a fragmented or sporadic pattern of development
- Exclusion of sites which fulfill an important community function such as playing fields, play grounds or other amenity land on the edge of settlements
- Rectification of settlement boundary anomalies in the current development plan

**Each small site that is currently not within a settlement boundary will be assessed using the above criteria.**

## **Stage 2 – Detailed appraisal**

**3.15** | For sites which have been successfully filtered through Stage 1 this next stage will involve a detailed assessment based initially on the information submitted with the Candidate Site forms together with desk based evidence collected by officers and inspections of the sites. All sites greater or equal to 0.3 hectares and for which a residential use is being proposed will be assessed to see how they perform against the following criteria:-

## **Planning Assessment:**

**3.16** | The Planning Assessment will consider if the site complies with the search sequence approach advocated in national planning policy and whether the site is previously developed or green field land. In addition paragraph 9.2.9 of Planning Policy Wales sets out the criteria which should influence the allocation of housing sites in the LDP and an extract is attached at appendix B for information. In addition environmental planning considerations will be taken into account, namely, flooding issues, landscape/green barrier implications, bio and geo-diversity, the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, national mineral protection policies together with any historic environment designations. Where relevant the sites planning history will be taken into account.

**3.17** | It is recognised that many sites are likely to have some level of constraint on them that can impact on their suitability for development or may reduce the developable area of a candidate site. The type and level of constraint will vary on a site by site basis. Therefore in settlements where more sites are available than are required to meet the housing requirement and the plans spatial strategy, the decision as to which sites will be taken forward will depend on the nature of constraints in terms of whether they can be overcome or are insurmountable, those sites with the least constraints will be taken forward as sites with fewer constraints are more likely to come forward for development.

**3.18** | Alongside consideration of constraints, the Authority will also assess whether the site has particular development opportunities for example:-

- Will the proposal involve the re-use of suitable previously developed land/buildings?
- Will the proposal remove an eyesore/untidy site/un-neighbourly use?
- Does the proposal align with any forthcoming public transport improvements and/or plans of other service providers?
- Will development of the site help address issues identified locally by the Town and Community Councils and/or the Local Member?

## **Infrastructure:**

**3.19** | New development can place additional pressures on existing infrastructure such as highways, water supply, drainage and sewerage capacities as well as local facilities such as schools, medical and recreational facilities. Consequently the Council will engage with Natural Resources Wales, service providers such as Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water and all appropriate Council Directorates to establish whether such pressures on local infrastructure exist in order to inform the assessment process and highlight those locations for which new development would not be viable or realistic within the timescale of the Plan.

**3.20** | For example the Council's education department will be consulted upon regarding the capacity of schools to determine whether they are able to accommodate pupils generated from new development or whether it will be necessary to secure developer contributions to ensure that there is sufficient capacity within facilities either through improvements or extensions to schools.

## **Accessibility:**

**3.21** | Consideration will be given to the suitability of vehicular access to and from the site. This will

focus on the potential impact upon the highways network and the level of constraint in achieving an acceptable access as to whether a new or improved access will be necessary to enable the site to be developed. This part of the assessment will also be used to identify if additional information such as a Traffic Impact Assessment (to be provided by the Candidate Site proposer) will be required to fully appraise the site.

**3.22** | National planning guidance highlights the importance for new development to have access to a range of services, facilities and employment opportunities, which can also be accessed by existing communities. Consequently the relative distances to existing facilities, public transport stops and frequency of service will be considered. For housing proposals the assessment will first examine the site in terms of whether it is located within or outside a settlement. Secondly the ease of pedestrian and cyclist access to key services such as primary schools, doctors surgeries and local shops will also be assessed.

**3.23** | The Institute of Highways and Transportation Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot (2000) suggests that for residential development in terms of commuting, schools and recreational journeys, walking distances of up to 2000m can be considered, with the desirable and acceptable distances being 500m and 1000m. Consequently the Council will broadly assess the accessibility of sites against the criteria below:

|                   | <b>Facilities e.g. shops, bus stops</b> | <b>Commuting/school</b> |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Desirable         | 200m                                    | 500m                    |
| Acceptable        | 400m                                    | 1000m                   |
| Preferred Maximum | 800m                                    | 2000m                   |

Source: Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot (IHT 2000) \* Acceptable walking distances to facilities are defined as those where a high proportion of the trips generated by new development can be conveniently made by passenger transport, on foot or by bicycle.

**3.24** | In the case of retailing and leisure proposals, or ‘other uses best located in centres’, these will be assessed according to whether they should be located within existing town, district and local centres (i.e the ‘sequential approach’), as advocated in PPW, this includes considering the merits in defining ‘new’ local centres, where there is an existing lack of local facilities, that would overcome this issue.

## **Economic Viability:**

**3.25** | Delivering the Plan’s preferred strategy is a critical function of the LDP and the Council needs to be confident that any allocated site has a realistic prospect of being developed for its intended use within the plan period up to 2030.

**3.26** | Several factors can affect the viability and deliverability of a site. These can for example include inappropriate adjoining uses, ransom strips, land contamination issues, a lack of infrastructure or the marketability of an area. Another important issue to consider is, is there a genuine identified need

for the type of development and its proposed location? Similarly it will be necessary to assess if the site is genuinely available for development, especially where the site proposer is not the land owner, or if there is a site in multiple ownership. Where there are concerns about the potential economic viability of a site, the assessment will identify whether a development appraisal (to be provided by the Candidate Site proposer) will be required.

**3.27 | Full details of the proposed site assessment criteria are given in the officer assessment form as shown in Appendix C. It is considered that the criteria will enable the Council to take a consistent and rational approach in the assessment of potential development sites.**

**3.28 |** In addition to candidate sites for housing the Council is proposing to adopt the following approach for other types of land uses being proposed as a candidate site:

### **Retail Proposals:**

The site selection process for retail sites will have regard to any relevant retail or other studies prepared by or on behalf of the Council and the sequential assessment of sites in relation to retail centres as outlined in Planning Policy Wales.

### **Employment Proposals:**

Proposals for new employment, or mixed use sites containing employment, will be considered further in relation to the level of employment land required to achieve the LDP Strategy and will also be informed by Flintshire's Employment Land Review 2014.

### **Community Facility Proposals:**

Community Facility proposals including open/green spaces and equipped playgrounds will be assessed in relation to whether there is a need for the facility and/or the proposer can provide a strong indication of its deliverability e.g the proposer owns the land or a source of funding is identified.

### **Minerals and Waste Proposals:**

Candidate sites for minerals and waste will be assessed against the up to date Regional Waste and/ or Minerals plans together with any locally identified requirements. Candidate sites which are likely to prejudice mineral resources will be assessed having regards to national minerals policy.

### **Sites to be protected from Development:**

The Candidate Site process will also be used to draw attention to sites which should be protected from development and importantly why the land merits protection for example by virtue of a green barrier or green space designation or an area of wildlife importance not previously identified in the adopted UDP. It is envisaged that these sites will be assessed as to whether they satisfy the relevant criteria to be designated as such, having regards to Planning Policy Wales and also whether it is appropriate to carry over the approach contained in the adopted UDP. Land should only be protected from development where it is necessary and appropriate to do so based on sound planning principles and not merely to prevent development from taking place.

**3.29** | The above uses list is not exhaustive and the candidate site assessment methodology cannot cater for every scenario. Any proposed uses not covered by the above will be assessed on their individual merits having regards to the most up to date local and national planning policy and if necessary consultation with the relevant organizations.

## **Stage 3 – Compliance with the preferred strategy**

**3.30** | To deliver the preferred LDP strategy it should be acknowledged that some but not all of the settlements in the County will be required to accommodate growth and continue to be the focus of future planned development. The scale and type of which will have regards to the need for development, existing infrastructures and/or constraints, thereby directing future development to the most appropriate and sustainable locations. In order to achieve this, the preferred strategy will set out where growth should be directed.

**3.31** | In addition to the approach taken for housing development in the preferred strategy the County towns and key settlements offer other roles such as retail or employment centres which will have a bearing in determining the suitability of candidate sites.

**3.32** | Once the preferred strategy has been agreed those sites which have successfully passed through stages 1 and 2 will be assessed to see if they are compatible with it. For example is the site associated with a growth area identified by the plan strategy?, is the site a potential development opportunity located within an existing urban area? or does the site constitute a potential development opportunity that represents an extension to an existing urban area that would not undermine the preferred strategy?

**3.33** | Agreeing the Plan strategy will also help to identify the potential acceptability and contribution of small sites which are located outside but adjacent to those settlement boundaries currently identified in the UDP having regards to the criteria identified in stage 1 – initial filtering of sites. As an integral part of the plan preparation all settlement boundaries will be reviewed to determine if they are still appropriate in light of the preferred strategy. The Council will also consider making minor changes to the boundaries e.g. to take account of permissions granted for development on sites outside but adjoining a settlement or where existing boundaries are considered to be illogical.

**3.34** | As the preferred strategy has not yet been formulated it is not possible to provide details at this stage. However the preparation of the Preferred Strategy, will take account of site information gathered as part of the Candidate Site process. All those involved in the LDP whether developers, interest groups and persons who have submitted candidate sites will have the opportunity to have a say during the LDP strategic growth and spatial options consultation period.

**3.35** | This stage in the process aims to determine if a candidate site has the potential to meet the LDP preferred strategy. Conflict with the preferred strategy is also likely to reflect conflict with national guidance in some instances. Sites which are considered not to accord with the preferred strategy will not be progressed further than this stage and will not be considered for inclusion in the Deposit version of the Plan. Of the ones that are considered suitable at this stage, once the amount and distribution of development has been determined it will be possible to identify how many sites are needed. In the event that more candidate sites exist than are required, then only those that are least constrained and perform best following the assessment process will make it through to the Deposit plan as an allocation.

## **Stage 4 - Assessment with other studies and strategies**

**3.36** | Alongside the Candidate Site process, there are parallel processes of considering potential sites through related assessments that are triggered by preparing a plan of the nature and scope of the LDP. These include a Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal (SEA/SA), an appraisal in accordance with the Habitat Regulations, Health Impact Assessment and also an Equalities Impact Assessment.

**3.37** | Those sites not considered as representing reasonable proposals are likely to have been dismissed earlier on in the assessment process and will not be carried forward in to the SEA/SA assessment. Sites which accord with the Preferred Strategy will then be assessed against sustainability criteria identified by the Council as part of the SEA/SA process. The assessment process will involve examining each site that has successfully passed through stages 1,2 and 3 in terms of its likely impact (positive or negative) on each sustainability objective identified by the SEA/SA exercise.

**3.38** | It is important to note that these assessments together with other studies such as the Council's employment land review and housing viability are not the sole determinants in considering the appropriateness of a site, but rather it forms part of an integrated approach to site selection having regards to the other stages contained in the assessment methodology.

**3.39** | The Council will use the results of the SEA/SA in order to finalise the remaining Candidate Sites as to their appropriateness for allocation within the LDP. This approach is underpinned by the principles of sustainable development and the SA assessment of a site's merits will provide a further valuable test as part of the wider assessment methodology process.

**3.40** | This part of the assessment methodology will also apply to any uncommitted and unimplemented UDP allocations which are shown in Appendix D. Should this process result in any previous allocations not being taken forward into the LDP, then these existing allocations will be clearly identified in a subsequent Candidate Sites assessment report detailing the reasons for this. Existing UDP allocations which are still considered to be appropriate for inclusion by virtue of their successful progression through the assessment process will also be clearly identified.

**3.41** | Those sites which have successfully passed through all of the relevant stages of the methodology process and are considered necessary to meet the strategic objectives of the LDP will be set out in a Candidate Sites Assessment Report and subsequently shown either as allocations or where appropriate be included within the development boundary as shown on the Proposals Map of the LDP.

## 4 | What happens next?

**4.1** | A candidate site register is being prepared by the Council. This will be made available on the Council's website and hard copies will also be made available at Council offices and libraries. Please note that the register will be made available for information only (although personal information will not be published) and the Council will not accept comments on the sites contained in the register.

**4.2** | Following the completion of the assessment of the submitted sites the Council will in due course publish a report setting out its findings and recommendations which will be made available on the website and at Council Offices and libraries. The Council will advise either in writing or by e-mail of the availability of the report.

**4.3** | **If your site is unsuccessful** a reasoned justification will be provided as to why the site will not be recommended for inclusion in the Deposit Plan. If the original reason(s) for non inclusion of Candidate Sites can be overcome then there will be an opportunity to resubmit the site as an alternative site which can be lodged as an objection during the public consultation stage of the Deposit LDP.

**4.4** | **If your site is successful** in meeting the assessment criteria set out in this methodology and is considered to have the potential to contribute to the preferred Plan Strategy, the Council will then seek the views of external consultation bodies prior to any decision made to include it in the Deposit Plan as an allocation.

**4.5** | The specific consultation bodies will include:-

- Welsh Government
- Natural Resources Wales
- Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water
- Health and Safety Executive
- The relevant Community/Town Council
- The Coal Authority

**4.6** | Please note the Council reserves the right to announce a "second call" for Candidate Sites should the initial site submissions together with any additional sites identified by the Council be deemed insufficient to meet the development strategy of the LDP.

## **5 | How to comment on the Assessment Methodology:**

**5.1** | This is an opportunity to let the Council know your views on the proposed methodology. Please feel free to make any comments on this document either in writing or by e mail. However it would greatly assist the Council if you could provide answers to the questions as set out in the Appendix E. The questionnaire is available on the Council's website in a word format for those wishing to complete it. Alternatively a hard copy is available on request from the LDP team.

**5.2** | Copies of this document are available for inspection during normal opening hours at the Council Offices and Libraries. Electronic copies can be viewed and downloaded from Flintshire's website.

**5.3** | The closing date for the submission of comments on the Candidate Site Assessment Methodology is 5pm on Friday Monday 20th April 2015. Please forward your comments to:-

**Andrew Farrow**  
**Chief Officer (Planning and Environment)**  
**Environment Directorate**  
**Flintshire County Council**  
**County Hall, Mold, Flintshire**  
**CH7 6NF**

## **6 | Further Information and Advice**

**6.1** | For further assistance on the Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology process or the LDP in general please e-mail [developmentplans@flintshire.gov.uk](mailto:developmentplans@flintshire.gov.uk) or contact the LDP helpline on 01352 703213

## Appendix A

### List of Current Settlements in the Unitary Development Plan

| Settlement               | UDP Category |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| Afonwen                  | C            |
| Alltami                  | C            |
| Bagillt                  | B            |
| Bretton                  | C            |
| Broughton                | B            |
| Brynford                 | C            |
| Buckley                  | A            |
| Cadole                   | C            |
| Caerwys                  | B            |
| Carmel                   | B            |
| Coed Talon / Pontybodkin | C            |
| Cilcain                  | C            |
| Connah's Quay            | A            |
| Cymau                    | C            |
| Dobshill                 | C            |
| Drury & Burntwood        | B            |
| Ewloe                    | B            |
| Ffrith                   | C            |
| Ffynnongroyw             | B            |
| Flint                    | A            |
| Flint Mountain           | C            |
| Garden City              | B            |
| Gorsedd                  | C            |
| Greenfield               | B            |
| Gronant                  | B            |
| Gwaenysgor               | C            |
| Gwernaffield             | C            |
| Gwernymynydd             | B            |
| Gwespry                  | C            |
| Halkyn                   | C            |
| Hawarden                 | B            |
| Higher Kinnerton         | C            |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Holywell                                   | A |
| Hope / Caergwle / Abermorddu / Cefn y Bedd | B |
| Leeswood                                   | B |
| Lixwm                                      | C |
| Llanasa                                    | C |
| Llanfynydd                                 | C |
| Mancot                                     | B |
| Mold                                       | A |
| Mostyn                                     | B |
| Mynydd Isa                                 | B |
| Nannerch                                   | C |
| Nercwys                                    | C |
| New Brighton                               | B |
| Northop                                    | B |
| Northop Hall                               | B |
| Pantymwyn                                  | C |
| Pentre                                     | B |
| Pentre Halkyn                              | C |
| Penyffordd                                 | C |
| Penyffordd / Penymynydd                    | B |
| Pontblyddyn                                | C |
| Rhewl Mostyn                               | C |
| Queensferry                                | A |
| Rhes y Cae                                 | C |
| Rhosesmor                                  | C |
| Rhydymwyn                                  | C |
| Saltney                                    | B |
| Sandycroft                                 | B |
| Shotton / Aston                            | A |
| Sychdyn                                    | B |
| Talacre                                    | C |
| Trelawnyd                                  | C |
| Treolgan                                   | C |
| Treuddyn                                   | B |
| Whitford                                   | C |
| Ysceifiog                                  | C |

## Appendix B

### Extract from Chapter 9 Planning Policy Wales July 2014

#### Paragraph 9.2.9:-

Local Planning Authorities should consider the following criteria in deciding which sites to allocate for housing in their development plans:

- the availability of previously developed sites and empty or underused buildings and their suitability for housing use;
- the location of potential development sites and their accessibility to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car, and the potential for improving such accessibility;
- the capacity of existing and potential infrastructure, including public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals), to absorb further development, and the cost of adding further infrastructure;
- the scope to build sustainable communities to support new physical and social infrastructure, including consideration of the effect on the Welsh language, and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities;
- the physical and environmental constraints on development of land, including, for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk, taking into account the possible increase of such risk as a result of climate change, and the location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes;
- the compatibility of housing with neighbouring established land uses which might be adversely affected by encroaching residential development; and
- the potential to reduce carbon emissions through co-location with other uses.

## Appendix C - Candidate Site Officer Assessment Form

|   | <b>Criterion</b>  | <b>Commentary</b> | <b>Assessment criteria</b>                   |
|---|---|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Is the site within or adjoining an existing settlement?   |                   | Within a settlement                          |
|   |   |                   | Adjoining edge of settlement                 |
|   |   |                   | In open countryside                          |
| 2 | Is the site located on previously developed (brownfield) land? (as defined in Planning Policy Wales, fig. 2.1)  |                   | Brownfield                                   |
|   |   |                   | Part brownfield/ part greenfield             |
|   |   |                   | Greenfield                                   |
| 3 | Would the development of the site result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (in current or previous use)?   |                   | Does not result in loss of agricultural land |
|   |   |                   | Grade 3a and above                           |
|   |   |                   | Grade 1/2                                    |
| 4 | Is the site accessible from a public highway?   |                   | Yes  |
|   |   |                   | Yes, however requires improvements           |
|   |   |                   | No   |
| 5 | Is the nearby highway network capable of accommodating the resulting traffic movements?   |                   | Yes  |
|   |   |                   | Yes, however requires improvements           |
|   |   |                   | No   |
| 6 | 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, e.g. a bus stop or train station? |                   | Within 400m of regular service               |
|   |   |                   | Within 800m of regular service               |
|   |   |                   | No   |

|     |   |  |   |
|-----|---|--|---|
| 7   | Is the site located within 400m or 800m of a shop or selection of shops selling daily living essentials?                                |  | Within 400m of selection of shops   |
|     |   |  | Within 400m of single shop / within 800m of selection of shops  |
|     |   |  | No  |
| 8   | Is the site located within 1000m or 2000m of a school and other community facilities including recreation open space?                   |  | Within 1000m of school and a range of other community facilities  |
|     |   |  | Within 2000m of school and a range of other community facilities / within 1000m of some facilities only |
|     |   |  | No  |
| 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? |  | Would not result in a loss  |
|     |   |  | Would effect public access, however any impact could be mitigated against                               |
|     |   |  | Would result in a loss unacceptably effect public access  |
| 10a | Is the site located within 100m of existing water, sewerage, electrical, gas and telecommunication systems?                             |  | Yes   |
|     |   |  | No  |
| 10b | Is there a possible infrastructure capacity issue that could act as a constraint to development?  |  | No  |
|     |   |  | Possibly addressed through investigation / mitigation   |
|     |   |  | Yes   |
| 10c | Are there any high pressure gas or water pipelines running through the site that are a constraint to development?                       |  | No  |
|     |   |  | Yes   |

|     |  |  |   |
|-----|--|--|---|
| 11  | If the site is proposed for residential development, how does it relate to any industrial/employment uses adjacent to the site?                      |  | Close to “good neighbour” employment uses |
|     |  |  | Not close to employment uses              |
|     |  |  | Close to “bad neighbour” employment uses  |
| 12  | If the site is proposed for “bad neighbour” employment / waste / minerals development, are there any residential properties within 400m of the site? |  | Yes                                       |
|     |  |  | No  |
| 13a | Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at an International level?                                  |  | No  |
|     |  |  | Adjacent/ Close to                        |
|     |  |  | Within                                    |
| 13b | Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a national level?  |  | No  |
|     |  |  | Adjacent/ Close to                        |
|     |  |  | Within                                    |
| 13c | Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a local level?   |  | No  |
|     |  |  | Adjacent/ Close to                        |
|     |  |  | Within                                    |
| 13d | Is there a loss of or threat to mature trees or hedgerows within or adjacent to the site?  |  | No  |
|     |  |  | Adjoining                                 |
|     |  |  | Within                                    |
| 14  | Is development of the site likely to affect the habitat, breeding site or resting place of a protected species?                                      |  | No  |
|     |  |  | Potentially                               |
|     |  |  | Yes                                       |
| 15a | Is the site located within or close to the Clwydian Range Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  |  | No  |
|     |  |  | Adjacent/ Close to                        |
|     |  |  | Within                                    |
| 15b | Is the site located within or close to a designated green space?   |  | No  |
|     |  |  | Adjacent/ Close to                        |
|     |  |  | Within                                    |

|    |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 16 | LANDMAP evaluation (based on CCW LANDMAP database).  |  | Low<br>Moderate<br>High<br>Outstanding   |
| 17 | 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, and Historic Landscapes. |  | No<br>Adjacent/ Close to<br>Within   |
| 18 | Is the site within or adjacent to a Conservation Area to the extent that the setting would be affected?  |  | No<br>Adjacent/ Close to<br>Within   |
| 19 | Are there any listed buildings within or adjacent the site where the development would be to the extent that its setting would be affected?  |  | No<br>Adjacent/ Close to<br>Within   |
| 20 | Are there any Scheduled Ancient Monuments within or adjacent the site to the extent that its setting would be affected?  |  | No<br>Adjacent/ Close to<br>Within   |
| 21 | Is the site located within or adjacent an area prone to flood risk?  |  | No<br>Adjacent/ Close to<br>Within   |
| 22 | If the site is within or adjacent to an area at risk of flooding, is the risk of flooding acceptable, having regard to vulnerability of the development proposed.                                |  | Yes<br>Yes, with mitigation measures<br>No   |
| 23 | Do the topographical characteristics of the site present an obstacle to development?   |  | No<br>Yes, however any impact could be mitigated against<br>Yes, significant enough to prevent development |

|                            |  |  |   |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| 24                         | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on the character of a settlement?                      |  | No  |
|                            |  |  | Yes   |
|                            |  |  | Yes, significant enough to prevent development        |
| 25                         | Is there evidence that the site could consist of potentially contaminated land?                                |  | No  |
|                            |  |  | Yes, however capable of remediation                   |
|                            |  |  | Yes, however unlikely to be capable of remediation    |
| 26                         | Is there any evidence to question the viability or deliverability of the site?                                 |  | No  |
|                            |  |  | Possibly  |
|                            |  |  | Yes   |
| 27                         | Is the land likely to be adversely affected by land stability issues?  |  | No  |
|                            |  |  | Yes but capable of being addressed through mitigation |
|                            |  |  | Yes   |
| 28                         | Has the Candidate Site been used / or does it lie adjacent to or in close proximity to a former landfill site? |  | No  |
|                            |  |  | Unknown   |
|                            |  |  | Yes   |
| <b>Overall assessment:</b> |  |  |   |

## Appendix D

### UDP Allocations to be Re-assessed

| Reference      | Settlement    | Site Name                          | Total Units<br>(Housing) | Comment  |
|----------------|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <b>Housing</b> |               |                                    |                          |  |
| HSG1 (3)       | Buckley       | Well Street                        | 162                      | No PP  |
| HSG1 (4)       | Buckley       | Somerfields                        | 30                       | No PP  |
| HSG1 (5)       | Connah's Quay | Highmere Drive                     | 162                      | No PP  |
| HSG1 (7)       | Connah's Quay | Adj Fairoaks Drive Mold Road       | 87                       | Appeal Decision Pending                                  |
| HSG1 (8)       | Connah's Quay | Ffordd Llanarth                    | 20                       | PP refused for petrol filling station – appeal dismissed |
| HSG1 (11)      | Holywell      | Lluesty Hospital                   | 70                       | Application under consideration                          |
| HSG1 (14)      | Mold          | Queens Park Hendy Road             | 51                       | No PP  |
| HSG1 (16)      | Mold          | Upper Bryn Coch Lane               | 15                       | Application under consideration                          |
| HSG1 (17)      | Bagillt       | Wern Farm                          | 45                       | No PP  |
| HSG1 (19)      | Broughton     | Compound Site                      | 54                       | PP on south part of site only                            |
| HSG1 (20)      | Caerwys       | Summerhill Farm, Drovers Lane      | 54                       | PP expires 19/7/14 - Application under consideration     |
| HSG1 (26)      | Gronant       | East of Gronant Hill               | 27                       | No PP  |
| HSG1 (32)      | Mynydd Isa    | Rose Lane                          | 57                       | Appeal Decision Pending                                  |
| HSG1 (38)      | Sychdyn       | Former Sewage Works, Wats Dyke Way | 63                       | No PP  |
| HSG1 (39)      | Coed Talon    | Station Yard/ Depot                | 57                       | Application under consideration                          |
| HSG1 (41)      | Pen-y-Ffordd  | Llys Dewi                          | 15                       | No PP  |
| HSG2B          | Holywell      | Former Holywell Textile Mill       | 120                      | No PP  |

## Employment

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <b>A comprehensive employment Land review is being carried out by the Council which will assist in identifying those employment allocations which will need to be reassessed</b> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

## Retail and Commercial Facilities

|        |           |                                     |     |                                   |
|--------|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|
| S1 (1) | Buckley   | Land adjacent to Brunswick Road     | N/A | <b>No PP</b>                      |
| S1 (3) | Mold      | Land South of Chester Road          | N/A | <b>No PP</b>                      |
| S1 (6) | Broughton | Land North of Broughton Retail Park | N/A | <b>Appeal under consideration</b> |

## Community Facilities

|          |          |              |  |  |
|----------|----------|--------------|--|--|
| CF2 (iv) | Buckley  | Jubilee Road | Land allocated for a medical centre    | <b>No PP - alternative provision being made elsewhere in the town</b>  |
| CF5 (b)  | Holywell | Strand Park  | Land allocated for a community centre. | <b>No pp for a community centre but this site forms part of a larger site recently granted permission for a new school and associated site redevelopment</b> |
| CF5 (C)  | Ewloe    | Wood Lane    | Land allocated for a community centre. | <b>No pp</b>   |

## Appendix E

### Candidate Site Assessment Methodology Questionnaire

1. Do you agree with the proposed methodology as set out in this consultation document?

Yes  No

If no please explain why:

2. Do you think the proposed criteria to be used in assessing sites are fair, clear and logical ?

Yes  No

If no please explain why:

3. Is there any criteria that should be deleted from the list and not be used?

Yes  No

If yes which one(s):

4. Do you think that there should be any additional criteria which can be used to assess the LDP Candidate sites ?

Yes  No

If yes please give details:

5. Are there any other comments you have regarding the Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology ?