





## Settlement: CHURCHSTOKE


Site Summary		Site allocated in LDP
Candidate Site: 113	Land at Meadow Brook	✗
Candidate Site: 171	Land adj Hollydene	✗
Candidate Site: 411	Land adj to Harry Tuffin Supermarket,	✗
Candidate Site: 417	Land opp Harry Tuffin supermarket	✗
Candidate Site: 469	Land adjoining Buttercup House	✗
Candidate Site: 472	Site 1 -Land rear St Nicolas Church	✗
Candidate Site: 473	Site 2 - Land rear St Nicolas Church	✗
Candidate Site: 751	Land at Fir House	✓
Candidate Site: 752	Land at Mount Pleasant	✗
Candidate Site: 1123	Pt. Encl. 7065 and 7962	✓
Candidate Site: 1126	Land adj. Syringas	✗
Candidate Site: 1131	Pt. Encl. 5968 Blue Barn Farm	✗
Committed Site: P12 HC1	Land at Maes Neuadd (rear of Village Hall)	✓
Committed Site: P12 HC2	Land at the Garage	✓
Committed site: P12 HC3	Land at the Hatchery	✓

Site		Summary
<p><b>Candidate Site: 113</b>  <b>Site Address: Land at Meadow Brook</b></p> <p>The eastern part of the site consists of a large area of sloping pasture land with agricultural sheds, whilst the western part of the site adjoining Cross Likey Close and the existing UDP development boundary benefits from planning consent for 2 affordable local needs dwellings (one constructed and 1 under construction). Whilst the site could be argued as a logical extension to residential development in this area, it is considered that other more central and suitable sites are available without the risk of undesirable expansion into the open countryside. SFCA Stage 2 also identifies flood risk from the Castle Brook, the mitigation measures for which may limit the developable area. Furthermore, site commitments will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period and the land is not therefore required for land allocation.</p>		<p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is partially constrained;</li> <li>It may be considered an incursion into the open countryside; and</li> <li>It is poorly located in terms of accessibility to services.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p>


<p><b>Candidate Site: 171</b>  <b>Site Address: Land adj Hollydene</b></p> <p>Site consists of gently sloping pasture land that is bounded to the north, south and west by existing residential development and the UDP development boundary although it lies some distance from the settlement's centre and its services and facilities. Highways have revised their recommendation and consider that the site may be suitable for a limited number of dwellings. Therefore, the site is not considered suitable for land allocation (allocated sites accommodate 5+ dwellings) but is regarded as an appropriate site for small scale infill development. To facilitate this land use change, the site has been included in the LDP development boundary of the settlement.</p>		<p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as:  The site is constrained, most significantly by highway issues.  It is therefore considered that site commitments and more appropriate site allocations identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.  Nonetheless, it is regarded as an appropriate site for small scale infill development. To facilitate this land use change, the site has been included in the LDP development boundary of the settlement.</p>
---	---	---


<p><b>Candidate Site: 411</b>  <b>Site Address: Land adj to Harry Tuffin Supermarket,</b></p> <p>Site consists of a large area of pasture land on a southerly facing slope with an open aspect. The site is bounded by an existing supermarket and the UDP development boundary &amp; employment land allocation to the north and agricultural land elsewhere. Stakeholders have identified issues with the site's development, including a significant Highways constraint. In addition, the site extends some distance from the existing built form of the settlement and development on the site may therefore appear as an inappropriate incursion into the open countryside rather than a natural extension to the existing built form. Nonetheless, the site is proposed for recreation and leisure uses (including "holiday cabins of mixed use, and open space and other recreational use such as water sports"). The suitability of this use would be determined through a policy approach, not requiring a land allocation in the LDP.</p>		<p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as:  The site is constrained, most significantly by Highways issues;  It may be considered an incursion into the open countryside; and  The proposal is for recreation and leisure uses and such uses will be determined by a policy approach through the planning application process.  Therefore the site does not require a land allocation.</p>
--	---	--

<p><b>Candidate Site: 417</b>  <b>Site Address: Land opp Harry Tuffin supermarket</b></p> <p>A large site comprising a number of parcels of agricultural land and existing farmstead. The part of the site lies within the current UDP development boundary and is partially allocated for residential development (ref: M117 HA6). The existing residential allocation and an adjoining area benefit from planning consent for 7 dwellings (M/2003/0391) and 4 dwellings (M/2003/0392) respectively. The candidate site lies immediately to the north of the existing Cross Likey residential development and may be considered an extension of existing residential development in this area. However, the site is of significant size and extends some distance into open countryside. It is considered that site commitments in the settlement (including those within this candidate site) will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period This site is therefore not required for land allocation. Furthermore, given the concerns over the highways safety (limited frontage to create a safe access) and the scale of the proposals resulting in the loss of open countryside and the potential adverse impact on the landscape and character of the settlement, it is not regarded as a suitable site for allocation.</p>		<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>This housing site (P12 HC4) has been deleted due to updated evidence of landowner intentions which leads to the Council having fundamental concerns over the likelihood of delivery within the Plan period.</p>
---	---	---


<p><b>Candidate Site: 469</b>  <b>Site Address: Land adjoining Buttercup House</b></p> <p>Site is gently sloping pasture land that lies to the north of the highway between a UDP housing allocation (ref. M117 HA2) to the west and existing residential development and UDP housing allocation (ref. M117 HA6) to the east. Whilst the site itself does not lie within the settlement's development boundary it may be considered a logical extension to the built form of the settlement. However, a number of issues have been identified by stakeholders that may constrain the site's development. Highways have advised that a land allocation can only be supported if working in conjunction with CS751 (opposite side of main road) so as to provide suitable junction spacing etc. The site is also sensitive in heritage terms and its allocation would link two currently separate built up areas which may be to the detriment of the landscape and settlement character. The local council only support a smaller site. Notwithstanding the question as to suitability, the site is not recommended for allocation as it is considered that the existing site commitments in Churchstoke will</p>		<p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as:  The site is constrained, most significantly by Highways, Heritage and Landscape issues.</p> <p>It is considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p>
--	---	--

<p>meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period. The site is therefore not required for land allocation.</p>		
---	--	--


<p><b>Candidate Site: 472</b>  <b>Site Address: Site 1 -Land rear St Nicolas Church</b></p> <p>Gently undulating pasture land that is bounded by agricultural land and a cemetery. The site does not adjoin the existing settlement development boundary although the land between this candidate site proposal and the development boundary has been proposed as candidate site 473. Nonetheless, the site has a distinctly rural aspect and it is considered that residential development on the site would appear as an inappropriate incursion into the open countryside rather than a natural extension to the existing built form of the settlement. In this regard, the site also lies on the opposite side of the Camlad to the settlement, the watercourse and floodplain providing a distinct physical constraint to the settlement's expansion in this area. In addition, the Local Highway Authority has also identified significant constraints to the allocation of the site for residential 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:  The site is constrained, most significantly by Flooding and Highways issues.  It may be considered an incursion into the open countryside and would detract from the existing built form.  It is therefore considered that site commitments elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p>
---	---	---


<p><b>Candidate Site: 473</b>  <b>Site Address: Site 2 - Land rear St Nicolas Church</b></p> <p>Pasture land that slopes up from watercourse on south-western boundary to the current UDP development boundary along its north-eastern boundary. The site is bounded by agricultural land, the Churchyard and existing dwellings. Whilst the site adjoins existing development this development is within the Churchstoke Conservation Area and includes the Grade II listed Church of St. Nicholas. Stakeholders have expressed concern that development on the site will impact on the setting of the Church and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in this location. The site has a distinctly rural aspect and it is considered that residential development on the site would appear as an inappropriate incursion into the open countryside rather than a natural extension to the existing built form of the settlement. A significant section of the site also lies within the floodplain of the Camlad and the Local Highway Authority has also identified significant constraints to the allocation of the site for residential development. The site is therefore not considered suitable for allocation. It is also noted</p>		<p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as:  The site is constrained, most significantly by Flooding, Heritage and Highways issues; and  It may be considered an incursion into the open countryside and would detract from the existing built form.  It is therefore considered that site commitments elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p>
--	---	---


<p>that part of the site was previously put forward for residential use during the preparation of the UDP, the UDP Inspector concluding that flooding, highways and heritage issues raised at that time were "good reasons for not supporting the allocation of the site for housing purposes".</p>		
---	--	--

<p><b>Candidate Site: 751</b>  <b>Site Address: Land at Fir House</b></p> <p>A large area of gently sloping pasture land, bounded by hedgerows and fencing, part of which lies within the UDP settlement development boundary and is allocated for residential development (ref. M117 HA4). The site lies on the A489 through the settlement between two clusters of development. The site may therefore be considered a logical site for residential development in the settlement. However, the candidate site's southern boundary does not follow a physical boundary and the Community Council has expressed concern over the extension of the current UDP allocation. Heritage stakeholders have expressed caution due to historic landscape, setting and character issues including the undesirable joining up of two separate built up areas. Highways would support allocation if worked up in conjunction with access to site 469 (opposite) so as to meet acceptable highways standards. Stage 2 SFCA results show that a site specific Flood Consequences Assessment is required to demonstrate acceptable management of flood consequences. Whilst allocating part of the site would preserve the UDP housing allocation into the LDP period, importantly the evidence on need suggests that site commitments in Churchstoke are already sufficient to meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period. A land allocation of part of the site (mirroring the UDP allocation) is not therefore required whilst the larger site as proposed is not considered suitable or required.</p>		<p>It is not recommended that this site is allocated for housing for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The decision to allocate the new site has been made in response to representations received, including the views of the Community Council, and the change is proposed in recognition of the evidence raised concerning existing sites that are slow to be built, possible over-reliance on longstanding committed sites and the lack of any new housing land allocations in the revised LDP Deposit Plan for Churchstoke leading to lack of flexibility/choice. As a large village, Churchstoke has a range of facilities including employment opportunities and it is considered to be a sustainable location for new housing growth.</li> <li>2. ASN24 was submitted at the candidate sites stage (ref 751) and the proposed site allocation mirrors that currently in the Powys UDP, housing land allocation M117 HA4. The site has been selected as it has continued community support, has had the principle of residential development accepted since its inclusion in the UDP and is now free of land tenancy constraints which had previously impacted upon deliverability. The candidate sites status report (candidate site ref 751) will be reviewed accordingly. The flood risk area is not expected to be an issue with the revised part site as selected and the land requirement issues for the settlement have been re-considered - especially given the removal of one committed site (ref P12 HC4 - 11 dwellings) ) from the LDP through the focussed changes document. Irrespective of the possible</li> </ol>
---	---	---





		<p>constraints relating to the larger site as originally proposed it is considered that a site of that size is not required to match the growth strategy aims set out in the LDP so the smaller site is the more suitable in planning for 2011-2026.</p>
--	--	--

<p><b>Candidate Site: 752</b>  <b>Site Address: Land at Mount Pleasant</b></p> <p>Relatively flat pasture land that lies close to the existing UDP development boundary. Another Candidate Site proposal (CS113) lies between this site and the existing Cross Likey residential development to the west, and there are dwellings adjoining this site to the north-east and south-east. Whilst the site could be argued as a logical extension to residential development in this area, it is considered that other more central and suitable sites are available without the risk of undesirable expansion into the open countryside. Furthermore, site commitments will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period and the land is not therefore required for land 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.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p>
---	--	---

<p><b>Candidate Site: 1123</b>  <b>Site Address: Pt. Enclo. 7065 and 7962</b></p> <p>A large area of undulating pasture land, bounded by hedgerows and fencing, part of which lies within the UDP settlement development boundary and is allocated for employment development (ref. M117 EA1). The site lies on the A489 through the settlement between two clusters of development and adjoins the existing "Tuffins" supermarket site. The site therefore lies in a logical location for employment development in the settlement. However, the site extends some distance from the existing built form of the settlement and development on the site may therefore appear as an inappropriate incursion into the open countryside rather than a natural extension to the existing built form. Nonetheless, the entire candidate site was previously allocated for employment development in the Deposit Version Montgomeryshire Local Plan. Highways have reviewed their comments and confirm that an acceptable access is likely to be achievable. The Community Council has expressed concern over any extension of the current UDP employment land allocation. The need for employment land is considered further in the Employment Needs Study for the County. Given that the study does not support the need for a larger site, the LDP will allocate the same parcel as the UDP for employment uses (it should be borne in mind that LDP Policy can still enable future extensions to employment land where circumstances meet the policy tests).</p>		<p>The site has been taken forward as an employment allocation in the draft LDP as:</p> <p>It represents a logical location for employment development, was previously allocated in the UDP and benefits from an existing highway access. It is considered the identified constraints can be adequately addressed at the detailed planning stages.</p> <p>Allocation No: P12 EA1</p>
--	---	--

<p><b>Candidate Site: 1126</b>  <b>Site Address: Land adj. Syringas</b></p> <p>Sloping pasture land adjoining the UDP settlement boundary and housing allocation M117 HA2 which has planning permission and is currently being developed (LDP Inset Map Ref: P12 HC3). Highways only support the candidate site proposal if access is achieved off the A489 via the existing housing site. This modest site may be argued as a logical extension to the settlement, having residential uses on three sides. However backland development is not favoured and importantly, site commitments will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period so the land is not therefore required for land allocation.</p>		<p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as it may be considered back-land development and it is considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p>
--	---	--



<p><b>Candidate Site: 1131</b>  <b>Site Address: Pt. Enclo. 5968 Blue Barn Farm</b></p> <p>Site consists of gently sloping pasture land that lies between two dwellings along the C2055. The site adjoins the UDP's settlement development boundary, which lies to the south-west. However, the site lies some distance from the settlement's centre and its services &amp; facilities. There is also a significant Highways objection to the allocation of the site for residential development. The Community Council considers that the allocation of the site would lead to undesirable ribbon development. It is agreed that to extend the settlement boundary north alongside the minor road is inappropriate due to the loss of open countryside and the inadequate access. There are other more suitable sites in the settlement available to meet the housing need. For these reasons, the site is not considered suitable for allocation or inclusion within the development boundary.</p>		<p>The site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the draft LDP as:</p> <p>The site is constrained, most significantly by Highways issues;</p> <p>It may be considered an incursion into the open countryside; and</p> <p>Is poorly located in terms of accessibility to services.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that site commitments identified elsewhere will meet the housing requirement of the settlement over the Plan period.</p>
<p><b>Committed Site: P12 HC1</b>  <b>Site Address: Land at Maes Neuadd (rear of Village Hall)</b></p> <p>Commitment (site partially completed).</p>		<p>Committed Site: P12 HC1</p>
<p><b>Committed Site: P12 HC2</b>  <b>Site Address: Land at the Garage</b></p> <p>Site lies within the Yr Ystog character area of the Vale of Montgomery Registered Historic Landscape depending on its size and nature any proposed development here may require assessing under the ASIDOHL2 as part of any planning application.</p>		<p>Committed Site: P12 HC2</p>
<p><b>Committed site: P12 HC3</b>  <b>Site Address: Land at the Hatchery</b></p> <p>Site lies within the Yr Ystog character area of the Vale of Montgomery Registered Historic Landscape depending on its size and nature any proposed development here may require assessing under the ASIDOHL2 as part of any planning application.</p>		<p>Committed Site: P12 HC3</p>