



Settlement: CASTLE CAEREINION

| Site Summary | | Site allocated in LDP |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Candidate Site: 362 | Land North of Tynllan Farm | X |
| Candidate Site: 384 | Land along Henrhyd Lane (opp Tynllan Farm) | X |
| Candidate Site: 476 | Land opposite Chapel House | X |
| Candidate Site: 480 | Land adj Tynllan Farm | X |
| Candidate Site: 540 | Land adj. To N.E. Village Edge | X |
| Candidate Site: 697 | Land to south of Dol y Wennol | X |
| Candidate Site: 1081 | Land at Maes y Rhos | X |
| Candidate Site: 1092 | Tynllan Farm | X |
| Candidate Site: 1215 | Proposed site at Castle Caereinion | X |
| Committed Site: P11 HC1 | Land at Swallows Meadow | ✓ |

| Site | | Summary |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Candidate Site: 362 Site Address: Land North of Tynllan Farm</p> <p>Site consists of gently undulating pasture with an open aspect that is located on the edge of the settlement. It does not adjoin the existing UDP settlement development boundary but does adjoin other candidate site proposals (CS480 & 540). Given the size of the site, its development may be considered an incursion into the open countryside. The site also adjoins the existing sewage treatment works which may lead to future bad neighbour issues and complaints. The local highway authority has indicated that the development of part or all of the site in conjunction with the development of site CS480 would enable the provision of highway infrastructure to address existing highway safety issues in the settlement. Whilst recognising the potential for a highways improvement, after further consideration, including the evidence on housing need, it is felt that there is no reason to suggest that this particular settlement should be allocated more than the pro-rata growth ascribed to it through the LDP's strategic policy approach. Therefore it is considered that existing housing commitments together with the white land opportunities within the development boundary of Castle Caereinion will meet and in fact exceed the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period. A site of this size is not therefore considered suitable or required for land allocation.</p> |  | <p>The site has not been taken forward as a housing allocation in the draft LDP as given the size of the site its total development may be considered an incursion into the open countryside. It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the plan period.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Candidate Site: 384 Site Address: Land along Henrhyd Lane (opp Tynllan Farm)</p> <p>Site consists of gently undulating pasture with an open aspect that is located on the edge of the settlement. It adjoins existing residential development and sits opposite another candidate site proposal (CS480). Given the size of the current candidate site proposal, its total development may be considered an incursion into the open countryside and partial allocation of the site may therefore be preferable. Part of the site was previously proposed for development during the preparation of the Unitary Development Plan, however, the UDP Inspector did not recommend allocation as its development would represent an inappropriate level of growth at that time. The local highway authority has indicated that the current candidate site should be developed in conjunction with the development of sites CS480 & CS362. Other stakeholders have also identified issues with the site's development. After further analysis, it is considered that whilst a sizeable village extension could offer the benefit of highways improvements, there is no evidence to suggest that this particular settlement should be allocated more than the pro-rata growth ascribed to it through the LDP's strategic policy approach. Therefore it is felt that existing housing commitments together with the white land opportunities within the development boundary of Castle Caereinion will meet and in fact exceed the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period. A site of this size is not therefore considered appropriate or required for land allocation.</p> |  | <p>The site has not been taken forward as a housing allocation in the draft LDP as given the size of the site its total development may be considered an incursion into the open countryside. It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the plan period.</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Candidate Site: 476 Site Address: Land opposite Chapel House</p> <p>A large area of relatively flat pasture land that adjoins the UDP settlement development boundary. However, the site is large relative to the settlement and extends some distance from the existing built form. Part of the site was previously proposed for development during the preparation of the Unitary Development Plan. However, the UDP Inspector did not recommend allocation as its development would represent an inappropriate level of growth at that time and further considered that the natural boundary & gateway to the settlement boundary would be lost if the site were to be developed. Stakeholders have identified issues with the site's development, one of the most significant being Highways concerns that vehicular and pedestrian</p> |  | <p>The site has not been taken forward as a housing allocation in the draft LDP as given the size of the site, its location and access constraints. It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the plan period.</p> |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| access is not achievable. Due to the identified constraints, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. | | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Candidate Site: 480 Site Address: Land adj Tynllan Farm</p> <p>Site comprises of an existing farmhouse & buildings (that lie within the UDP settlement development boundary and partially within the settlement's Conservation Area) together with a parcel of relatively flat pasture land to the north (that lies outside but adjoining the development boundary). An element of the site (predominantly within the UDP boundary) has previously benefitted from planning permission for residential development (ref. M/2006/0169 & M/2006/0170). Consideration has been given to this site and adjoining site (or part site) CS362 providing a logical extension to the settlement. The local highway authority supports its allocation, in combination with adjoining candidate site 362, to address problems with the existing highway infrastructure in the settlement. However, whilst recognising the potential for a highways improvement, it is considered that existing housing commitments in Castle Caereinion together with the white land opportunities within the development boundary will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period. A site of this size is not therefore considered suitable or required for land allocation. Nevertheless the farmstead and land in the immediate vicinity is considered suitable to provide a logical and modest expansion opportunity for the settlement and this land is included within the settlement development boundary so as to facilitate re-development proposals and reflect past planning decisions (see also CS1092).</p> |  | <p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP however, some of the site does fall within the development boundary and could be developed through a policy approach, subject to satisfactory planning approval. It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Candidate Site: 540 Site Address: Land adj. To N.E. Village Edge</p> <p>Site consists of a large area of undulating pasture with an open aspect that is located on the edge of the settlement. It adjoins existing residential development and candidate site proposals (CS362 & 476). Given the size of the candidate site proposal and its location the site's development may be considered an inappropriate incursion into the open countryside. In addition, the highway authorities have identified significant constraints to the site's development. The site is therefore not considered suitable for allocation.</p> |  | <p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as it may be considered an incursion into the open countryside and is constrained by access issues. It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Candidate Site: 697 Site Address: Land to south of Dol y Wennol</p> <p>An area of gently sloping pasture land that adjoins the Swallows Meadow development but not the settlement development boundary. The site is prominent due to its topography and is divorced from the existing County Highway network. Other Stakeholders have also identified issues with the site's development. The site is therefore not considered suitable for allocation.</p> |  | <p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as it is prominent and divorces from the existing County Highway network. It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p> |
| <p>Candidate Site: 1081 Site Address: Land at Maes y Rhos</p> <p>Flat pasture land that adjoins the UDP settlement development boundary. At the UDP Inquiry, the Inspector did not recommend allocation as its development would represent an inappropriate level of growth at that time and that the natural boundary & gateway to the settlement boundary would be lost if the site were to be developed. LDP Stakeholders have identified issues with the site's development including significant Highways concerns that vehicular and pedestrian access is not achievable. Furthermore SFCA Stage 2 results have shown that the flood risk at this site is not considered manageable. The site is therefore not considered suitable for allocation.</p> |  | <p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as the natural boundary & gateway to the settlement boundary would be lost if the site were to be developed and it is constrained. It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p> |
| <p>Candidate Site: 1092 Site Address: Tynllan Farm</p> <p>Site comprises of an existing farmhouse & buildings (that lie predominantly within the UDP settlement development boundary and partially within the settlement's Conservation Area) together with a small parcel of relatively flat pasture land (that lies outside but adjoining the development boundary). The site has previously benefitted from planning permission for residential development (ref. M/2006/0169 & M/2006/0170). The site may be considered a logical location for additional residential development in the settlement. However, the local highway authority would only support its allocation in combination with adjoining land, to address problems with the existing highway infrastructure in the settlement. Due to the constraints and the availability of committed housing land elsewhere in the settlement to meet identified needs, it has been deemed more appropriate to include this site within the development boundary to facilitate appropriate re-development (reflecting past planning</p> |  | <p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP however, some of the site does fall within the development boundary and could be developed through a policy approach, subject to satisfactory planning approval. It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| decisions) rather than make a land allocation which may not be deliverable. | | |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Candidate Site: 1215 Site Address: Proposed site at Castle Caereinion</p> <p>Site consists of flat pasture land that lies within and adjoining the existing UDP settlement development boundary. The site extends some distance from the settlement and may therefore be considered an inappropriate incursion into the open countryside. Consideration has been given to allocation of part of the site (land to rear of Chapel House) but due to the constraints that may impede development, including sewerage issues and uncertainty re: deliverability, it has been considered more appropriate to retain it within the development boundary. This will facilitate the smaller site as a windfall opportunity (and reflect the longstanding extant consent for the completion of the Maes Castell site, 4 remaining dwellings). The larger site as proposed is not required as the settlement already has a significant housing commitment to meet the required need and furthermore it would represent an unacceptable extension into the countryside and detract from the natural gateway to the Castle Caereinion.</p> |  | <p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP however, some of the site does fall within the development boundary and could be developed through a policy approach, subject to satisfactory planning approval. It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p> |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| <p>Committed Site: P11 HC1 Site Address: Land at Swallows Meadow</p> <p>Commitment. Partly developed, partly under construction. *Project level HRA screening required - Tanat and Vwrnwy Bat sites SAC and Montgomery Canal SAC (hydrological connections).</p> |  | <p>Committed Site: P11 HC1</p> |
|---|---|--------------------------------|