

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
Powys CC Highways	Adoption - What are their intentions with regards to adoption of highways, given previous discussions? PCC will look to secure a layout that meets adoptable standards and will issue & secure Advance Payment Code notices to protect the public in line with legislation contained within the HA1980.	This is a detailed matter. The Brief requires that the layout meets the relevant requirements as appropriate.
Powys CC Highways	Page 7 A40 Junction – Design shall be in accordance with WG/Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standards	The Development Brief has been updated.
Powys CC Highways	Page 7 - The use of “shared surface” streets requires careful consideration as they often conflict with “inclusive design” objectives and may result in large commuted sums. Consideration will only be given to appropriate lengths that provide adequate DDA provision, adequate levels of parking and siting of services. Consultation with access groups should be promoted and also a pedestrian design audit may be required. They may be appropriate in certain areas however there will definitely be a requirement footways in most locations. (this is all generally covered by the previous reference to design manuals)	Detailed design consideration. It is noted that the previous update accounts for this comment
Powys CC Highways	Material mixture – Advise commuted sums policy will apply to “non-standard” equipment	The Development Brief has been updated.
Powys CC Highways	Parking – Parking provision will be in line with the CSS Standards only? On street parking will only be considered for visitor use and street widths shall be designed accordingly. Parking must be “local & usable”	The Development Brief has been updated.
Powys CC Highways	Page 8 - Not sure what they mean by reference to “lanes” What is the proposed emergency exit? This will need approval from WG?	Lanes are intended to form more localised access roads. Proposed emergency access is required by NRW.
Powys CC Highways	Page 12 – A comprehensive refuse strategy shall be required. This shall demonstrate that streets will be accessible to those vehicles expected to use it and that adequate provision is provided for the siting of receptacles etc. Close liaison required with HA.	The Development Brief has been updated.
Powys CC Highways	Page 14 – Clarification required for Public – Private Realm. PCC will only adopt those areas that form	The Development Brief has been updated.

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	part of the highway & pedestrian links.	
Powys CC Highways	Page 15 & 17 – Whilst it may well be acceptable to utilise existing road routes, the alignments of such may need to be adjusted to fulfil the desired 20mph speeds and full reconstruction will be necessary to adoptable standards.	Detailed design consideration. The Brief requires that the layout meets the relevant requirements as appropriate.
Powys CC Highways	20 mph design speeds – 20mph design speed is welcomed (page 7), however forward visibility will need to be restricted between 25-70m (main access problem)	Detailed design consideration.
Powys CC Highways	More detail required on road hierarchy and likely business uses in order to determine road layout and parking provision. What is the emergency lane fore (WG implications)	Detailed design consideration.
Powys CC Highways	Use of Existing Roads – Whilst the location/alignment of the existing roads may well be acceptable, it is highly unlikely that the construction would be acceptable (page 15)	Detailed design consideration.
Powys CC Highways	Illustrated Layout little detail potential conflict areas and no sign of turning areas.	Detailed design consideration.
CPAT	The proposed 'enhancements' around the scheduled monument close to the main entrance will need to be defined more clearly and early discussions will need to take place with CADW on designs in this area.	The Development Brief has been updated.
CPAT	We note that there is no Cultural Heritage section in the proposed EIA contents. Unless Cultural Heritage has been deliberately scoped out for some reason this topic should be included and the CgMs archaeological assessment, which has already been completed, could form the substantive basis of this section. The Historic Environment Record at the Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust should be used to enhance the cultural heritage data as new records may have been added in the intervening years.	There have been two scoping opinions on the site both have excluded it due to the considerable technical information that already exists in relation to the site. This is covered as part of the planning application process.
CADW	Access and movement p7 – any improvement or widening of the access road from the A40 should avoid further encroaching upon the present grassy setting of the standing stone and should therefore be restricted to the eastern side of the present access drive. A worst case scenario	The Development Brief has been updated.

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	would be the stone – one of the finest in Wales-standing immediately adjacent to a road or fenced drive .	
CADW	<p>Land use principles p10 – Cadw also has some concerns over the vision to ‘enhance’ the site and surroundings of the standing stone as a ‘feature’. Whilst relatively low key, the present setting on grass overlooked by mature trees is pretty much what Cadw would aim to achieve for sites in pasture or parkland elsewhere. It is important that the monument is not encroached upon by clutter such as fencing, signage or interpretation panels.</p> <p>This is one of the largest standing stones in Wales and the only one of a group of similarly sized examples in the middle Usk Valley with potential for public access. Some sensitively located, on site interpretation, would be welcome in order to highlight its significance – BBNPA have recently installed a panel near rather than next to Maen Llia, which achieves this at a discrete distance. Cadw would be happy to advise on location and content.</p>	The Development Brief has been updated.
CADW	The proposals are unlikely to impact on the registered park and garden at Glangrwyney Court, which lies approximately 400m to the east or on the listed building Le Chateau. You may, though, wish to consult Welsh Historic Gardens Trust in respect of the registered park and garden as it is a Grade II designation.	Noted
BBNP Conservation Manager	It’s encouraging to see that a lot of the environmental components that we sought first time round have become core to this proposal.	Noted
BBNP Conservation Manager	Development density and broken and open edge adjacent to the parkland: welcomed but may need some planning restrictions to prevent subsequent in-fill development	The LDP sets the parameters for development in terms of location and scale. The Development Brief is based upon this.
BBNP Conservation Manager	Parkland managed to improve biodiversity: welcomed, will require a management plan (S106?); recommend integrating this with sustainable urban drainage to create wetlands, provide irrigation for community food growing areas etc	As noted this will be dealt with through s106.

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
BBNP Conservation Manager	<p>Tree planting also for biodiversity enhancement reasons, e.g., to create green space continuity through the development (e.g., a landscape fit for bats and birds)</p> <p>Tree planting will be required anyway for the two purpose-built bat houses that have previously obtained planning permission, to facilitate bat navigation to and fro and to provide cover</p> <p>Tree planting will therefore have to be considered in relation to street lighting, to minimise glare, light spill and deterrent effect on bats</p>	Landscape proposals will be part of detailed design stage for approval by the NPA. This includes the detail of biodiversity mitigation.
BBNP Conservation Manager	<p>Architectural design standards, green design: how far will this go? Living surfaces?</p> <p>Architectural design standards, using natural resources: this point was made for the previous design brief, i.e., building design needs to start with sustainable urban drainage, rainwater recycling, green solutions for grey water/sewage disposal in mind, so that capacity for these is maximised rather than retro-fitted; this will then influence the layout and design of the buildings</p>	The Brief requires a SUDS system (as long as it is technically feasible) and detailed design elements will be a part of subsequent detailed planning applications.
BBNP Conservation Manager	Local food growing: capacity needs to be based on a percentage of the residential population being provided with the facilities to participate; so does this mean facilities available to 100% of properties %? 50%? 25%? What's the vision, what's the local need, what's the future need (resilience, flexible design)?	Detailed design consideration and is subject to future demand.
BBNP Conservation Manager	Children's play spaces: what's the vision for integrating this with biodiversity mgmt. of parkland, local food growing?	It is part of the comprehensive master planned approach as set out within the Brief and will be part of the overall management of the site.
BBNP Conservation Manager	Transition communities: what scope is there for this development to be designed as a transition settlement? What design principles can be tested here? (Scope for research by Cardiff University?)	For detailed consideration. This is outside of the scope of the Development Brief and LDP.
BBNP Conservation Manager	Community shop: as a hub for local business products, local food production? Farm produce supermarket? See	This is an aspiration for the site set out within the Development Brief.

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	http://www.suffolkfoodhall.co.uk/ for example	
BBNP Conservation Manager	Energy, heating: what scope is there for district heating systems, combined heat and power, PV ready houses, wood-fuel-ready houses, ground-source heat-ready houses?	The Development Brief requires that the proposal is in line with national requirements.
Conservation Manager	Please ensure that houses have chimneys/flues built in as standard, to future-proof them	Detailed design consideration.
BBNP Conservation Manager	Car parking: what will the developers offer to minimise hard-standing (surface runoff) and over capacity for parking? Welcome the idea of courtyard parking	Detailed design consideration.
BBNP Conservation Manager	Street scene and neighbourly interaction: the intent, through street scene to encourage interaction is welcomed, however if these properties effectively become commuter homes for city slickers, interaction will be minimal. Therefore the developers need to ensure that they've integrated the design to give neighbours something to interact about and to find local employment	The DB provides the framework for such interaction. Detailed design will need to respond accordingly.
BBNP Conservation Manager	Section on Environmental Sustainability: all of this is welcomed, plus see comments above; good to see the LDP working so well so early into its life!	Noted.
BBNP Conservation Manager	Public realm: use of common service trenches welcomed	Noted
BBNP Conservation Manager	Intent welcomed to seek comprehensive planning permission, to include long term mgmt. planning and maintenance plan; however, given the 'organic' nature of the development proposed, the BBNPA may need to consider how, within comprehensive permission, flexibility can be achieved to future-proof this development.	We believe that this is inherent within the brief and the level of detail is appropriate the brief to help future proof the scheme.
Coal Authority	No specific comments to make at this stage as the site is located off the coalfield.	Noted
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Front Cover This photograph is incorrect when this document was published in January 2014. The context of buildings and landscape as depicted no longer exists. Typically a number of mature trees within the site and along its boundaries have either been	Front cover updated. It was previously confirmed that Richard Rogers has had no previous involvement at the site.

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	<p>thinned out or completely removed. Moreover a number of former structures, some of which positively contributed to the landscape, have been demolished. Of particular note was the 'triangular church' believed to have been designed by the renowned architect Richard Rogers.</p>	
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>01- Introduction (page 1) In essence the Introduction is correct although the Development Brief previously supplied in 2008 was for 200 + houses whilst the current brief is for a lesser number. That aside a reduction in the number of units still has a significant impact on strategy and landscape which, in the Community Council's view is still detrimental to the community and the environment as a whole. Justification in support of the Community Council's views is clarified below. In essence, the Community Council considers that if there is a fundamental and unequivocal need for the proposed development to occur, more suitable sites spread throughout the Park Authority boundary would be a better solution rather than this glut of locating non required and unjustified dwellings on one particular site, namely Cwrt-y-Gollen. Endorsing the development brief proposal will be more akin to meeting personal gain than Community need.</p>	<p>The principle of development is established within the LDP</p>
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>02 - Background and Planning Status (pages 2 - 3) It is recognised that the site was allocated under the approved Unitary Development Plan (UDP). However it is also particularly important to note that a recent outline planning application for 200 houses along with business/commercial buildings was refused and the subsequent appeal dismissed in July 2011 – Planning Inspectorate reference APP/P9502/A/10/2132455. The Community Council believes that the proposed development will not provide a social, economic or environmental need for the benefit of National Park Authority purposes or duties. It is more akin to opportunism than recognising there is a fundamental need to develop the Cwrt –y- Gollen site for the community good. The overall community considers development in principle, let alone to the scale envisaged, should not occur. The grounds, both for the refusal of the initial development and subsequent dismissal of the appeal, are in the Community Council's view, equally valid to the current proposal. Should the</p>	<p>The principle of development is established within the LDP</p>

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	latest proposal progress to the planning application stage, objections along the lines stated in this paper will be submitted to the Council.	
	The Community Council considers that the development brief encroaches on land which should be devoid of new building and allotment use. This would then minimise development in accordance with PPW guidance and the Community Councils vision.	The Development Brief is in line with the location of development identified within the LDP.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>03- Site Description (page 4)</p> <p>The Community Council wishes to see the opening paragraph of this section clarified. Demolition of certain structures occurred post the MOD interest in this land although the document implies that this seemed to be MOD action. The MOD itself had earlier applied in 2007 for planning consent on their retained part for such structures/uses as a field hospital; weekend training centre and new headquarters for the 'Reserve Forces (TA) and Cadet Association', all of which would accommodate 500 personnel. The new headquarters has been built and is now operational. The MOD uses the new modernised training facilities inclusive of the original band school as an 'Army Recruitment Centre' with the original officer's mess accommodating RAF recruits. All of these facilities are operational 24 hours 7 days a week. Such facilities will remain operational 24/7 even if residential development is constructed in accord with the draft development brief. Given this scenario, it would be incorrect to state the land was a 'former army camp' as military operations are still occurring and there is no indication that this activity will cease in the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>Noted, the description has been amended to ensure it clearly reflects the location of the RFCA HQ.</p> <p>Of note there is no retained military use or presence associated on the Development Brief site.</p>
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>04 -A Vision for Cwrt-y-Gollen (page 5)</p> <p>This chapter refers to workshops that were organised in preparation of the original development brief relating to 200 + dwellings. It was made very clear at the time by both local residents and the Vale of Gwryney Community Council attendees that any development on this site was totally unacceptable. The residents/Community Council insisted that the land be retained as 'open parkland' reflecting the character that was present prior to the military</p>	<p>The principle of development is established within the LDP in terms of location and amount of development.</p> <p>The Community Council were involved in a Stakeholder panel meeting and both the Council and residents were invited to a public exhibition.</p>

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	<p>requirements during the Second World War. It should be noted that no workshops were offered to either local residents or Community Council prior to the preparation of the current draft development brief. Both groups are still against ANY development on this site as confirmed by this report and the attached resident's petition representing 97% of the community. A statement made in connection with the original submission suggesting that the community as a whole was supportive of the proposals is incorrect and merely serves to incorrectly influence public opinion in favour of the development.</p>	<p>The feedback received at the exhibition was very positive and is summarised separately.</p>
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>At page 5 in highlighted red type, the draft brief states: “Cwrt-Y-Gollen will be an exemplar and sustainable part of the village of Glangrwyney that will make best use of its assets and local resources, with a strong complementary relationship to the existing communities of Crickhowell and the Vale of Grwyney.”</p> <p>The Community Council takes offence to such a bold statement. The above situation has already been tarnished in that Glangrwyney Cricket Club (following an incentive from the landowners) has unfortunately relocated from the centre of the village to the periphery of the community by partially using the above land. The relocation and the loss of the cricket club community facility could also become exacerbated if the anticipated gymnasium was to become available for ‘Village Hall’ use. This latter facility is directly within the hub of the existing settlement and re-siting further from the centre could impact on community users. Consequently one of the bullet points raised on page 5 namely “A supportive and considerate community” would be eroded in that the above proposals would, without doubt, impact on community residents.</p>	<p>The public exhibition showed overarching support for the vision amongst attendees.</p> <p>Subject to further detailed consideration there may be no scope for the gymnasium to be re-used.</p>
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>If the development principle has to be established on this site against the will of the local community; any housing should be limited and blend in with the existing dwellings at the adjoining Dan- y-Gollen residential site. Development occurred here approximately 10 years ago following extensive consultation between the Brecon Beacons National</p>	<p>The Brief supports the integration of new proposals with existing.</p> <p>Dan y Gollen formed the first phase of the redevelopment.</p>

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	<p>Park Authority and local community. The scheme replaced 36 prefabricated houses with 36 modern properties and the completed development is considered an asset to the village. Unfortunately, as will be addressed below, the draft development brief proposals will fall short of such an accolade and could in fact contribute to the erosion of the environment as a whole.</p>	
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>The objectives advocated within the development brief at page 7 seem, at first glance, admirable. However, the principle of development is flawed in that 'access and movement' within and approaching the site will be directly affected by flooding. The Environment Agency's plans clearly show that the A40 primary network road serving the site along with access within the site lie within Flood Plain 2 and 3 zones. This will impact not only on residents leaving or entering the site but also accessibility for emergency and refuse vehicles. It is worth noting that some properties in the vicinity of the proposed development have either been refused building's insurance or have had special conditions imposed due to the risk of flooding.</p>	<p>This was considered through the LDP.</p> <p>NRW have no objection in terms of flooding. An emergency access will be provided.</p> <p>No properties will be at risk of flooding.</p>
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>It is considered that existing roads only should be used. No new roads should be created as this will impact on character and diminish the open landscape quality of the 'parkland'. Emergency vehicles should only use suitably upgraded existing roads and no new emergency access should be directed to the adopted highway at Dan-y-Gollen or the private road at Martell Way.</p>	<p>This is a detailed consideration.</p>
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>It is considered by the Community Council that the envisaged scale of the proposal would be out of accord with the settlement pattern in the locality. With particular regard to access and movement, the existence of more traffic entering and exiting the A40 Trunk Road would be detrimental to the impact that local residents should endure. It is too great a step to enfold and if development has to occur, it should be significantly less by only utilising existing buildings.</p>	<p>The principle of development is established within the LDP in terms of location and amount of development.</p>
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>Character The Community Council consider that the only new development that should occur strictly uses the area available within the fabric of existing 'building</p>	<p>The principle of development is established within the LDP in terms of location and amount</p>

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	envelopes' and any existing hard landscape areas ancillary to these structures. The latter would include established parking areas or footpath routes to individual standing buildings. Those structures which have already been demolished and only have concrete foundations/footprints remaining should, along with any grassed areas not be developed. By taking this approach it will limit the size of the development to the previously developed part of the parkland and protect the remaining portion of parkland from development.	of development.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	There should be no encroachment onto parkland or any existing grassed area.	The principle of development is established within the LDP in terms of location of development.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Development densities can be controlled by development only occurring by using the footprint of existing standing structures. No new development should take place on those current areas which indicate the remnants of demolished structures. Utilising existing buildings will also have the advantage of minimising the need for new infrastructure as these established facilities such as electricity/telephone/water/sewerage connections can be re-used.	The principle of development is established within the LDP in terms of location and amount of development. It is likely that new infrastructure will be required.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Any new dwellings constructed within the above criteria should only be two storeys with ancillary garaging being single storey in keeping with Dan-y-Gollen. If the brief identifies the re-use (as opposed to rebuild) of existing three storey structures on site; the rebuild should ensure such 3 storey structures fit into the landscape. This can be established if axonometric pictorial drawings accompanied any revised development brief. In particular, views into the site from outside vantage points such as the dram road between Gilwern and Llangattock would be of immense benefit.	The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to detailed assessment through the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Although the Community Council support the initiative of allotments and children's play areas, such facilities should be located within the curtilages of existing buildings and not located in the open parkland setting. The provision of play equipment, linear or rectangular allotments along with the inevitable array of garden sheds would create a dramatic eyesore to the area particularly	Such uses are entirely appropriate within the parkland area. The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to detailed assessment through

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	in the foreground when viewed from the A40 and vantage points.	the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	If development does occur in general accordance with the development brief, the allocation of the 'parkland' in future Development Plans should remain in perpetuity. A new title should be established for the designated 'parkland' and a specific covenant included restricting development of any kind within the area covered by the title in perpetuity. It should also stipulate a requirement to maintain it to a standard suitable for the purposes for which it is intended.	The principle of development is established within the LDP in terms of location of development.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>Land Use Principles</p> <p>Although a number of these principles seem acceptable, the Community Council is against the scale of the development as stated above and below. That aside, if a portion of the site is to be primarily set aside for B1 use (Business), this might be preferable to C2 (Residential Use) as occupants of a nursing home for example could be significantly effected by noise from the nearby firing range currently operational. That noise impact could effect residents of the dwellings as well and therefore the suggestion in the brief (page 15 – Design and Considerations) must be fully integrated into the development before planning consent is granted to any type of residential scheme. Mock battles using blank bullets/thunder flashes in the nearby woodland will still continue and this noise impact has not been addressed in the development brief. The brief MUST holistically address not only what is within the brief area alone but also MOD activities outside the brief area and extant planning consent for the anticipated new firing range. Only then should the 'development brief' continue to full public consideration.</p>	<p>The principle of development is established within the LDP in terms of location and amount of development.</p> <p>The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to detailed assessment in relation to noise through the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).</p>
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Although a small Class A1 shop could be of benefit, the Community Council has some concerns. Due to its location some distance from the proposed housing and the existing village, probably local residents will drive to the location whilst other footfall will be via motorists along the A40 Trunk Road. This location could necessitate significant traffic movements on and off the trunk road and will require suitable off street parking. It is also	The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to detailed assessment in relation to traffic impact and flooding through the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	important to note that the proposed shop will be within the flood zone. These issues need to be fully considered taking in to account the effect it could have on the existing established food outlets in nearby Crickhowell. Also, if the site becomes 'a shop use', the possible future potential of a larger supermarket could significantly affect all communities as such a shop would not be anchored to any settlement centre.	
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	The report makes reference to the 'Parkland' being set aside for water attenuation/foul drainage treatment/sports use. Firstly regarding foul sewage, Planning Policy Wales Edition 6 February 2014 states at paragraph 12.4.2 that "Development proposals in sewered areas must connect to the main sewer, and it will be necessary for developers to demonstrate to local planning authorities that their proposal site can connect to the nearest main sewer" This has not been demonstrated in the brief. Moreover, earlier in the report reference is made to 'allotments' which will also be using the Parkland area. Clarification as to the exact position of all these facilities should be provided.	The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to detailed assessment in relation to drainage through the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Even with the reduced number of dwellings, it is anticipated that there will be a significant increase in the number of vehicles, possibly in the region of 200 +. This, together with the fact that both Crickhowell and Abergavenny are not within walking distances could result in a significant increase in the movement of vehicles on what is already a narrow stretch of the A40. Overall, it is believed that the site coupled with the surrounding area is not capable of sustaining a substantial increase in neither population nor vehicular traffic flow.	The principle of development is established within the LDP in terms of location and amount of development. The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to detailed assessment in relation to transport through the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Although the next page (page 11) of the development brief refers to Community Safety; the Community Council considers this aspect along with other sub sections such as environmental sustainability, public realm, trees and such like to be sub topics of the overarching principles – Key Design Considerations - on page 15. Consequently, the Community Council put forward at Annex A their concepts of what makes a good building prior to addressing these other issues presented in the development brief.	The design principles are based on those set out in PPW.

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>Community Safety</p> <p>In essence this section is in line with government guidance and Tan 12 - Design. However, the comments put forward in Annex A above also need consideration</p>	As previous comment.
	<p>Environmental Sustainability</p> <p>The Community Council supports the principles of the three core elements mentioned in this section. However, there are elements in the subsections that are of concern and contrary to Planning Policy Wales.</p>	
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>1. Achieving Efficient use and Protection of Natural Resources</p> <p>☑ As mentioned above, PPW requires wherever possible, connection to the mains sewerage system and the reasoning why this has been ignored has not been demonstrated in the development brief.</p> <p>☑ Development is not located outside the footprint of existing buildings. Access to the site is of particular importance and lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p>	<p>PPW allows for a range of technical solutions subject to detailed considerations.</p> <p>The location of development is in line with the LDP.</p>
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>2. Enhancing Biodiversity</p> <p>The Community Council has no issue with this item</p>	Noted
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>3. Designing for Change</p> <p>The Community Council supports the notion of live/work units and the overall ideals put in this sub section. Although it would be desirable to re-use existing buildings, this should only occur if they positively contribute to the setting. Some of the buildings on site are alien to the character of the overall national Park. They remain ubiquitous military structures and should not dictate the principle of directing 'good design' at Cwrt-y-Gollen or anywhere else. However, possibly suitable 'facadism' might work – that will depend upon the final details.</p>	
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>Public Realm</p> <p>The Community Council supports these principles if development occurs.</p>	Noted
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>Key Design Considerations</p> <p>In response to this section, the Community Council puts forward the following points:</p>	The development of the site based on the environmental

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
Council	Clarification is needed to the term 'environmental carrying capacity of the area'. In our view there should be no development and this has remained a consistent stance by the community as a whole, as demonstrated by individual visits to households and a petition.	considerations is in required by the LDP.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	If development occurs, this should only be positioned on footprints of existing buildings. Those buildings that have been demolished should return to grassland.	The principle of development is established within the LDP in terms of location of development.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Due to the fact that Cwrt-y-Gollen is physically separated from the village of Glangrwyney, it is doubtful that it will be perceived as being integrated. It will remain as isolated development in open countryside.	The principle of the development is established within the LDP.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Although the Community Council fully support re-use of existing buildings, tinkering with the fabric alone is not sufficient if the result still remains alien structures in the open countryside.	
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	The MOD firing range is a significant problem and noise attenuation measures need to be found if it is to remain. Noise occurs in the adjoining training area due to the use of firing blank ammunition (similar noise as live bullets) and use of thunder flashes. The Community Council considers that if this development proceeds, such a facility would need to be removed and re-sited in an established and perpetually retained MOD training area away from the development site. The use of adjoining woodlands for training purposes is also a major part of the problem as it is ancillary use to the firing range. Housing and military use are not good bed fellows.	The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to assessment in relation to noise through the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	06 – Development Framework (page 17) It was not the MOD that left a legacy to be proud of. Overall the MOD design solutions to their needs does not relate to domestic architecture. If as the development brief states that there should be an 'honest' approach to design, the legacy left by the MOD is abominable. The Community Council are confident in stating that if MOD development at that time had been subject of the normal planning process as opposed to 'Crown Immunity' the	The MOD have played, and continue to play an important role in the history of the National Park and vice versa. Numerous local residents live on the first phases of the re-development (Dan y Gollen and Martell Way).

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	<p>layout/style/setting would have been totally different and positively contributed to the Park landscape. Possibly, the very concept of using such land for military purposes may well have been resisted. Consequently today's local residents would have enjoyed the formal parkland setting of Cwrt-y-Gollen.</p>	
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>07 – Illustrative Layout (page 18) It is appreciated that the illustrative layout is only one possibility. The Community Council's comments above provide another opportunity more in keeping with the locality. Whatever is the final version of the development brief, this should be accompanied by axonometric plans that provide a relatively simple process for interested parties to visualise the finished development. One dimensional plans are not sufficient.</p> <p>08- Drivers for Design & Development Character (pages19 - 22)</p> <p>The development character of the site should be shaped by what it was really intended for – namely Parkland. This feature should be the driving stimulus for design and not alien MOD buildings. Supporting that latter concept will certainly result in the site not being a contemporary 'showcase'.</p>	<p>The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to assessment in relation to visual appearance through the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).</p> <p>The proposed land uses are led by the principles set by the LDP.</p>
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>The subsections relating to Village Green; Parkland Edge; the Green Corridor; the Employment Courtyard; the Parkland are all very commendable if this development brief is agreed. The Community Council firmly believe that their solution as expressed above would be a significant and lasting approach to ensuring the National Park statutory purposes are retained.</p>	<p>Noted support for character areas.</p>
<p>Vale of Gwryney Community Council</p>	<p>09 – Community Benefits (page 24) Although the 13 point community benefits are admirable, the Community Council consider that Vale of Grwyney residents will not directly benefit from development being approved at the above site. There is a need for the developer to address other community benefits for the locality including off street parking, connection of the Glangrwyney village as existing to main sewerage, further play areas and maintenance of existing, village halls and supporting Llanbedr School. Discussions should arise with the Community Council to address these particular issues if development occurs.</p>	<p>Any s106 requirements will need to be compliant with CIL which requires that they meet the relevant legal tests and are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms 2. directly related to the development; and 3. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	Coupled with this, the developer should also recognise that they will be obliged to consider the final requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy incorporating the Community Infrastructure Levy sent out for consultation in March 2014.	
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	It is accepted that there is a legal requirement for either 30% affordable housing or a commuted sum to be paid by the developer. The Community Council questions the need for affordable housing in the Cwrt-y-Gollen site and, hence, if development on this site is to proceed without affordable housing, the commuted sum associated with it should be allocated to an area which has already been identified as having affordable housing needs.	The need is established within the LDP and is a key requirement of the National Park.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	This would meet the criteria identified in the adopted Local Development Plan (LDP) Objectives SE2 Affordable Housing "To ensure that good quality, affordable housing of all types will be accessible to the Park's communities where there is an identified need"	Noted
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Crickhowell has the entire infrastructure in place including shops, post office, doctors' surgery all within walking distance eliminating the use of the motor car, meeting the requirements in Planning Policy Wales 6 February 2014 section 8.1.4 below: "Land use planning can help to achieve the Welsh Government's objectives for transport through: • reducing the need to travel, especially by private car, by locating development where there is good access by public transport, walking and cycling" Sites in Crickhowell have already been identified in the adopted Local Development Plan and should be used for this purpose.	The Development Brief accords with the LDP.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	The firing range cannot be construed as a 'community benefit'. It is perceived as a 'Community nuisance' along with offsite training in the nearby woodland.	If it is perceived as a community nuisance then it follows that any mitigation that reduces noise from the range will be a benefit.
Vale of	10 – Delivery & Phasing (page 24)	This would be dealt with

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
Gwryney Community Council	Construction work should be limited to sociable hours.	through standard planning conditions.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	11 – Environmental Impact assessment (EIA) (page 24) The Community Council supports this principle which clearly shows the development is of some significance. The Community Council will respond accordingly when such details are made available.	
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Appendix 1 (pages 25 -26) The issues relating to particular policies in this Appendix have been addressed and commented on above. In particular, the Authority should fully consider the Community Council’s reservations over the need for affordable housing on a site which cannot rationally be considered as a fully recognised ‘brownfield site’	The need for affordable housing in the area is established within the LDP.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	Conclusions 1. The scale of development envisaged in the brief will be detrimental to the enjoyment of the landscape, it is of no benefit to the local community, and there is no real or perceived need for it. It would be contrary to the National Park Statutory purposes.	The scale of development is established by the LDP.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	2. The Community Council would wish to see no development as access is within the flood zones and the development would be out of character.	Redevelopment is established within the LDP.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	3. If development does occur, details of the scheme via an updated development brief should be re-circulated for public scrutiny. The revised development brief should at the minimum be accompanied by axonometric plans taken from public vantage points. Development should be kept to a minimum and only use existing standing structures, roadways and footpaths as opposed to the footprints of demolished buildings.	The Development Brief has been consulted upon through both stakeholder panel meeting and a 6 week formal public consultation. The development framework is set by the LDP.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	4. The park land should be devoid of structures such as allotments and other domestic paraphernalia, for example, play equipment. The Parkland should remain as parkland in perpetuity even if the revised development brief is eventually	Play equipment will be appropriate within the Park land area and will be a considerable enhancement of the existing setting which

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
	endorsed.	includes the parade ground and a large stand.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	5. The scale of community benefits should be extended and Community Infrastructure Levy imposed	S106 contributions will need to be in line with the CIL regulations.
Vale of Gwryney Community Council	<p>6. If the underlying purpose of the proposed development is to fulfil a genuine social, economic or environmental need, a significant amount of additional work is needed by the developers to demonstrate to the community that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ The proposal will genuinely fulfil such needs ☐ There is no damage to the character of the surrounding areas ☐ The surrounding areas are capable of sustaining a substantial increase in population and traffic ☐ Other more suitable sites that are perhaps closer to or part of an existing town or village have been considered ☐ There will be no adverse impact to existing residents in a variety of matters such as traffic congestion, safety and such like. 	<p>The need is established by the LDP.</p> <p>The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to assessment through the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).</p>
DCWW	We note that the proposed development of the site includes the provision of a new waste treatment works to deal with foul discharge. To enable a more detailed understanding this approach and to allow us to provide additional comments we would encourage the developer of the site to engage with DCWW to provide further information.	DCWW have confirmed no objections in relation to the application.
DCWW	Notwithstanding the above, as a general principle we encourage and support development that promotes the use of SUDS, and therefore look to your Authority to ensure an appropriate design of the site that includes water efficiency and sustainable drainage proposals, in order to comply with policy 58 of the Local Development Plan.	
BBPS	The parkland character of the site should be preserved, especially for views into the site from the A40. The provision of allotments and community orchards (p.10) is to be commended but they will need to be appropriately sited and the allotments well screened, possibly by the orchards, in order to preserve the parkland character. Similar care will need to taken with the siting of the play area.	Noted

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
BBPS	<p>Mention is made of the housing making the most of views out of the site (pages 9, 15 and 21). The priority, rather, should be the screening of the development from the views into the site, so that the effect of the development on the special landscape of the Park is minimised. While the Development Brief proposes 3.7ha housing compared to the 7ha of housing in the rejected application 09/03405/OUT, it should be pointed out that this will nonetheless be a significant extension north and westwards of the existing limits of housing development formed by properties on Martell Way and Dan y Gollen. We consider that careful screening by tree planting should be specified to mitigate the effects on views from the A40 and from the hillside slopes across the Usk Valley. In the Inspector's report mentioned above, the fact that the landscape and visual impact of that proposed development would be contrary to the statutory purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the Park was given as one of the main reasons for recommending the dismissal of the appeal (paragraphs 247-257 of the report).</p>	<p>The Development Brief requires that detailed proposals will be subject to assessment in relation to landscape and visual impact through the planning application process and through EIA process (as set out in section 11 of the Brief).</p>
BBPS	<p>Lighting: it is suggested that there should not be overlighting of the public realm and streets (page 11). We question whether there is a need for any permanent lighting in what will be quiet lanes and streets, away from the main road. This development could be an exemplar in the Park for developments to dispense with street lighting as have many villages in other parts of the UK (e.g. the Cotswolds). This would reduce light pollution, save energy and be beneficial to wildlife.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be subject to detailed consideration by PCC in relation to adoption of elements of the infrastructure.</p>
BBPS	<p>It is noted that the Parkland Edge is to be kept free of cars. However, it is not clear from the illustrative layout which way the buildings in the Parkland Edge will be orientated and where the drives and garages (and therefore cars) mentioned on page 21 will be placed.</p>	<p>It is expected that buildings would be orientated towards the park land with landscaping to provide an appropriate soft transition.</p>
BBPS	<p>No buildings should be more than 2 storeys except where existing 3 storey buildings are located (page 11, bullet point 1). The wording "should generally be 2 storeys" (page 20, The Parkland Edge, para 3) leaves open the possibility of 3 storey buildings in this area, and should be changed.</p>	<p>There are presently three storey buildings on site. This would be subject to detailed consideration and impact assessment.</p>

Who	Comment	Response (where appropriate)
BBPS	<p>The suggestion that up to 3 homes should be exemplars of housing design and resource efficiency within the Park is to be welcomed. However the Development Brief should make this (and the achievement of CFSH Level 6 or Passivhaus status) a definite requirement, otherwise developers are likely to avoid this suggestion to save costs. Also, why only three? The vision (page 5) was that the whole of Cwrt y Gollen should be an exemplar.</p> <p>The provision of a community shop is to be welcomed, but it would be better if it were more centrally placed if it is to achieve the desired aim of fostering community spirit with the residents of the village of Glangrwyney and the two intervening housing estates. The provision of a community shop should be made a planning obligation.</p>	<p>The Development Brief requires that the proposal accords with National guidance in this respect.</p> <p>Achieving such high standards would inevitably increase the market price of housing and impact upon affordability. It is felt that 3 dwellings goes above and beyond the requirement and provide an opportunity for exemplars subject to detailed considerations.</p> <p>With regards to the shop, it is hoped that its present location would make it more viable and able to take advantage of passing trade. It is considered that being located within the development, it would not be a viable proposal as such shops rely upon passing trade rather than the small number of residents.</p>
Housing	<p>We are cautiously receptive of the reduction in numbers over the first application and proposal and are willing to work with agents and developers to agree the mix of affordable homes according to BBNPA policy as set out in the LDP.</p>	Noted
Housing	<p>I would reiterate my hope that the affordable units are not concentrated in the existing barrack blocks as this would form a perceived ghetto. Also they should be a mix of home types including both apartments and houses as discussed with Rhodri recently.</p>	Noted