



Rhondda Cynon Taf

Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Diwygiedig 2020-2030

Revised Local Development Plan 2020-2030

# Candidate Site Methodology

October 2020



# Candidate Sites Methodology

	<b>Page no.</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. THE LDP CANDIDATE SITE PROCESS</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. CALL FOR CANDIDATE SITES AND THEIR SUBMISSION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. STAGES OF SITE ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>14</b>

## *Appendices*

<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>Submission Form</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>Submission Form Guidance Notes</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix 3</b>	<b>Stage 1 Initial Assessment Appraisal</b>	<b>39</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1. The Delivery Agreement (DA) for the Revised Local Development Plan for Rhondda Cynon Taf was approved by Council on the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2020 and subsequently by Welsh Government on the 14<sup>th</sup> September 2020. The DA sets out the Timetable and methods of Community Involvement for the preparation of the Revised Local Development Plan (RLDP) for the period 2020-2030, with the preparation of the RLDP officially beginning in September 2020. The RLDP will re-consider all aspects of the current LDP, including all preparatory stages such as the Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan. All the current policies will also be reconsidered and in particular association with this methodology, so will the site specific allocations.
- 1.2. Accordingly, one of the key stages in the preparation of the RLDP, which is set out very early in the DA Timetable, is the submission and then consideration of Candidate Sites for site specific allocations, for a range of development types.
- 1.3. This document sets out the Council's methodology for the consideration of Candidate Sites. It firstly gives a general background to the Candidate Site process in relation to the LDP and what stages of preparation it is associated with. It then outlines what is required with regards to the submission of these sites for the RCT RLDP (including necessary supporting evidence) before setting out the details of the multiple stages of their assessment.
- 1.4. The Candidate Site Methodology has been prepared to ensure compliance with legislative requirements, national planning policy, as contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 10), and also national guidance in the Development Plans Manual (Edition 3), as appropriate. This will ensure that the identification of suitable sites for allocation is founded on a robust, transparent and credible assessment of the land submitted.

## **2. THE LDP CANDIDATE SITE PROCESS**

- 2.1. As mentioned above, the official 'Call for Candidate Sites' is the first formal stage in the preparatory stages of the RLDP following the agreement and publication of the DA. This process allows all parties to submit any potential sites to be considered for inclusion in the Plan. These will then be assessed and a determination made as to whether each site is suitable, or not.
- 2.2. Candidate Sites play a considerable role in the formulation and ultimate success of the RLDP, as some of them will become the allocations that are fundamental to meeting the needs that are identified in the Plan. These include housing, employment retail and other needs, as set out below in the list of Candidate Site land uses.
- 2.3. **The key principle of the Candidate Site process**, is to gather suitable evidence from site promoters to robustly demonstrate the sustainability, deliverability and financial viability of sites for inclusion in the plan. The Development Plan Manual suggests that the process should enable the following questions to be answered:
- Is the site in a sustainable location and can it be freed from all constraints?
  - Is the site capable of being delivered (can the site be developed through the plan period, or otherwise significantly progressed).
  - Is the development of the site financially viable?

### **What Candidate Sites can be submitted for;**

- 2.4. Candidate Sites can be proposed for a variety of land uses some of which are set out below, however this list is not exhaustive:
- Housing
  - Employment
  - Retail
  - Gypsy and Traveller Sites
  - Community Facilities
  - Leisure
  - Tourism
  - Renewable Energy
  - Green Infrastructure
  - Biodiversity
  - Waste
  - Minerals
  - Health/Education/Social Care
  - Transport Infrastructure

**What land can be included in the Candidate Site process.**

- 2.5. There are no restrictions on what land can be submitted into the process. It may include that which is either currently contrary to the existing LDP or otherwise not designated for development at present. It will also be necessary to fully re-assess all existing allocations, or assess them for an appropriate change of their current allocated use. **However, it should be clearly noted that only limited areas of land will be suitable for allocation**, and this methodology should indicate to any prospective promoter of land whether their land would pass the necessarily stringent assessments.
- 2.6. Candidate Sites can include undeveloped land, or preferably land that is currently, or has previously been, developed. Conversions of buildings may also be included in the process. The threshold of size of sites will be set out further below.
- 2.7. The origin of sites that will be included in the assessment process, can be categorised into four main types (although again, this is not exhaustive):

Sites Promoted by Private Landowners and External Agencies;

- 2.8. This includes sites submitted by private landowners, their agents, public and private developers.

Rhondda Cynon Taf Land Review Sites (Council owned land);

- 2.9. Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council is one of the major landowners in the area. The Council is currently in the process of reviewing land and property in its ownership.
- 2.10. Please note that sites where the Council and indeed other government or public agencies are site promoters, any sites promoted must demonstrate delivery through inclusion in a disposal strategy. All promoters of land will be treated equally in this process.

Undeveloped Existing LDP Allocations

- 2.11. An essential part of the revision of an LDP is the consideration of those allocations within the existing Plan that have yet to be developed. All residential, employment or other commercial allocations that have not been developed will be reassessed to ascertain whether they can be carried forward into the LDP.
- 2.12. Sites allocated in the current LDP cannot simply be 'rolled forward'. These sites will need to be evidenced that they can be delivered. If this is not the case then these sites will be de-allocated. There may be more appropriate uses for them and allocation changed accordingly.

- 2.13. If there is less certainty on their deliverability, and therefore specific allocation is not appropriate, there is allowance in the process to designate such sites for a 'Regeneration' role e.g. brownfield sites that are too constrained to deliver viable development, although in appropriate locations for development, or other public use. Such sites may require funding to come forward.

#### Sites Identified by the Council

- 2.14. The Council will undertake a range of studies to proactively identify suitable land and buildings across the County Borough to be considered further through the Candidate Site process. This will include an overarching Urban Capacity Study with specific requirements within. This could be the identification of opportunities in Town Centres, land in close proximity to them or evolving public transport nodes; or other sites which have a good relationship with our urban areas.

#### **The RLDP Stages**

- 2.15. Further details of the assessment process are outlined later in the Methodology. However, the Candidate Site process within the RLDP stages begins with the Call for Candidate Sites, which will open to allow their submission from October 2020 through until March 2021. Following initial assessment, the first indication as to whether there are fundamental constraints to the suitability of a site for allocation would be at the Preferred Strategy stage. The Council would not then determine the suitability of the site for allocation until the subsequent Deposit RLDP. Final allocation would not be in place until the Examination in Public has taken place and the RLDP adopted. A brief outline of the Timetable of the RLDP is shown below;

<b>Key Stage</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
<b>Definitive</b>	
Commence Pre-deposit Preparation	September 2020
Call for Candidate Sites	October 2020 to March 2021
Preferred Strategy (Pre-Deposit) Consultation	November/December 2021
Deposit Revised LDP Consultation	October/November 2022
<b>Indicative</b>	
Submit Revised LDP to the Welsh Government	April 2023
Independent Examination	August/September 2023
Adoption	March 2024

### **3. CALL FOR CANDIDATE SITES AND THEIR SUBMISSION**

- 3.1. The Council wishes to engage with Candidate Site promoters in a positive, co-operative and transparent way, and will endeavour to undertake the Candidate Site process in the same manner with a clear information trail and evidence to demonstrate a site's progress through the process. The Council requests the same of site promoters to achieve maximum co-operation between parties.
- 3.2. The Council wishes to allow as much time as possible for the submission of sites into the Candidate Site process especially given the information that is required to support a site submission. Therefore, even though the Development Plans Manual suggests a period of 6 weeks, **the Call for Candidate Sites for the RCT RLDP will be open for an extended period from October 2020 to March 2021.**

#### **Candidate Site Submission Form**

- 3.3. The Council has produced a standard Candidate Site Submission Form which should form the basis of any formal Candidate Site submission into the RLDP preparation process. The form asks for a range of detailed information about the site, and is included as an appendix to this paper. **Failure to submit a suitably completed form would result in the Candidate Site not being registered.**
- 3.4. It is expected that the form is completed as fully and as accurately as is possible, or otherwise the Council would request further information, or make judgements on the required information. Indeed, all submissions will have a necessary level of checking of accuracy undertaken against the breadth of comprehensive data we hold and can access.
- 3.5. The Council would encourage all parties to submit Candidate Sites and additional reports and information via email/ online, although paper forms can be arranged as necessary and submissions will be accepted by post. A guidance note has been prepared for the Submission Form and the questions therein. The Planning Policy Team will also be happy to answer any queries you may have on the process. The contact details are included at the end of the document, **with the Submission Form included as Appendix 1 and the Submission Form Guidance Notes as Appendix 2.**

#### **Further site submission information**

- 3.6. To ensure that the plan preparation process is effective, the Council requires that as much evidence as possible is provided at the Call for Candidate Site submission stage, alongside the above Submission Form. This would include any relevant studies, reports and other information to evidence that the site is in a sustainable location, free from constraints, is deliverable and viable.
- 3.7. It is considered that the information that is required to be submitted alongside the Candidate Site should be proportionate to the nature and scale of the

development proposed, and ultimately sufficient to enable the Council to assess it (being referred to as 'frontloading'). This should be gauged from the content and questions in the Submission Form and the Stages of Assessment (details in the next section of the methodology). The Development Plans Manual states the following;

***Where inadequate evidence is provided upfront this leads to further evidence being sought later in the process, incurring time delays. A more detailed preferred strategy will not only provide more meaningful consultation responses, but it will provide greater evidence to influence and shape the deposit plan. Front loading of the evidence base is critical to this approach. An inadequate level of information to demonstrate delivery can be a reason for discounting sites.***

- 3.8. It is nonetheless accepted that not all information, or at an appropriate final level of required detail, may be available, or financially practical at the initial submission stage. The Council does recognise that elements of viability of a site may not always be definitive until more detailed constraint and deliverability information is known. The Stages of Assessment below also indicates that our final assessments of the sites, including viability, will be made after the Preferred Strategy consultation stages.
- 3.9. If there is uncertainty over what is considered a level of supporting information that is proportionate to the nature and scale of the development proposed, or uncertainty of the level of financial investment, it may be prudent to submit the site early in the Call for Candidate Sites. This may allow for the Council to correspond with the promoter as to what further evidence is required; or otherwise indicate that the site has fundamental constraints to its allocation.
- 3.10. Should information not be submitted at the Call for Candidate Site submission, the Council will request this information if and when it determines it necessary and appropriate, (this may be at any stage from initial submission to the Deposit RLDP preparation). **Any investment in site promotion is at the promoter's discretion.** Where deliverability, viability and all other requested information is not forthcoming, the Council may not have enough evidence, and therefore may not be able to determine whether the site is suitable for allocation.

### **Constraints plan and signposting**

- 3.11. To further support all promoters the Council has prepared a constraints plan to help identify constraints on your sites. The constraints plan does not necessarily contain every constraint or designation. Where these are better displayed elsewhere (such as information prepared and held by other bodies that may change throughout the plan preparation process e.g. flood risk) the Council has provided signposting in the Submission Form Guidance Note for where you can find this information.



## When can Candidate Sites be submitted

- 3.12. The Call for Candidate Sites is the most appropriate time to formally submit a site, and all necessary background evidence, for potential inclusion in the RLDP. Representations to the Preferred Strategy may then form the submission of further sites to be considered in the Candidate Site process. All new Candidate Site submissions and site specific representations made after the Preferred Strategy consultation period would be considered in direct accordance with paragraphs 3.72 to 3.78 of the Development Plans Manual Edition 3 <https://gov.wales/development-plans-manual-edition-3-march-2020>; unless there is an official further Call for Candidate sites at that time, although this isn't currently anticipated.

## Site Categorisation and Thresholds

- 3.13. In order to establish a practical approach to Candidate Sites, the Development Plan Manual advises that a site size threshold is established. This would subsequently set a scale for appropriate allocations to be included in the RLDP.
- 3.14. For residential Candidate Sites specifically, the minimum site threshold is either 10 dwellings, or a minimum site size of 0.3 hectares. There is no defined upper limit.
- 3.15. Smaller sites are welcomed into the process and will be recorded in the Candidate Sites Register, however these will be considered in different ways. If such smaller sites are on the outside edge of exiting settlement boundaries, they will be considered further as appropriate amendments to the Settlement Boundary. Smaller sites within the existing urban Settlement Boundaries may be considered further with regards to their suitability for development; and therefore to give some indication of the number of residential units they may accommodate as 'windfall' sites. Such smaller sites can also allow for the development of 'Self Build' residential properties to come forward. It may also be the case that a collection of smaller sites in an area, or the conversion of several buildings in an area. E.g. town centres, could be amalgamated to give an indication of the potential scale of housing coming forward there. Smaller sites will be assessed against stage 1 of the assessment, as set out in section 4 below, if it is proposed that their current use or land use is changed.
- 3.16. Due to the breadth and type of other potential Candidate Sites there are no minimum site thresholds for all other land use Candidate Site submissions. However, discretion is held by the Council as to whether allocation is appropriate, or otherwise the principle of the proposed development would be acceptable without allocation, considering future RLDP policy and National planning policy.

### **Notification to landowners and publicity**

- 3.17. The Council's website and in particular the RLDP pages, will be kept up to date with all the relevant Candidate Site process, guidance and opportunities for involvement, including submission forms and contacts for the Planning Policy Team.

### **Acceptance of sites and reference number**

- 3.18. Once a Candidate Site has been submitted and is received by the Council to an acceptable level of completion, these are referred to as 'duly made', notification will be given to the promoter of the site that this is the case (or not) and a unique representor number allotted. This reference can be used when contacting the team about the site. Once again, in order to reduce the use of paper site promoters are encouraged to provide an email address for correspondence during the process. However where this is not possible the Council will notify you via letter.

### **Register of Candidate Sites**

- 3.19. Following the Call for Candidate Sites, the Council will publish a Candidate Sites Register (CSR). The register will include all sites submitted and accepted as duly made to be considered in the Candidate Site assessment process.
- 3.20. **It should be noted that the submission of Candidate Sites, nor its acceptance as being duly made, must not in any way be construed as a commitment to its suitability for inclusion within the plan.**

#### **4. STAGES OF SITE ASSESSMENT**

- 4.1. It is essential that the land allocated for development in the RLDP meets the objectives and requirements of the Plan, and is suitable for and capable of being developed. The Council will undertake a comprehensive four stage site assessment process. It will be ensured that this process is clear, objective and transparent, with a trail of a sites' progress through it.
- 4.2. The Stages of Site Assessment contain criteria that allows the Council to filter out those sites that are suitable for development and those that are not at each specific stage. These include physical and locational characteristics and also broader principles such as National Policy, inclusive of the Well-being of Future Generations Goals and the Planning Policy Wales Sustainable Placemaking Outcomes.
- 4.3. The statutory process of Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) will be incorporated into the site assessment and identification process, which will align with the overall SA/SEA undertaking for the whole RLDP preparation process. This, however, as is the intention of the Council, will be undertaken as a broader Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA), including wider areas of assessment e.g. Health Impact Assessment, Welsh language and Equality Impact Assessment etc.

#### **Stage 1 – Initial Assessment of the sites and their characteristics**

- 4.4. The Delivery Agreement for the RLDP indicates a longer time for Preferred Strategy preparation to that for the preparation of the Deposit RLDP. Accordingly, it was considered appropriate and necessary to have a broader understanding of the Candidate Sites prior to the consultation on the Preferred Strategy. In this respect, there is some deviation from the proposed methodology for stages of assessment in the Welsh Government Development Plans Manual.
- 4.5. The first stage Initial Assessment will therefore be a far more comprehensive process, essentially taking into consideration all matters submitted in the formal Submission of Candidate Sites. The assessment will indeed cover all those areas and principles set out in the Development Plans Manual as being appropriate for the later stage SA/SEA (ISA) assessment. However, the Initial Assessment process will be a more practical and physical assessment of the sites. This assessment nevertheless includes the appropriate criteria to determine whether sites have fundamental constraints to development/allocation. It also giving allowances for further evidence to come forward on certain sites as necessary and appropriate; and this at an early stage in the RLDP preparation process.

- 4.6. **The full Initial Assessment site appraisal sheet is shown in detail as Appendix C**, however, the appraisal sheet will be divided into sections to cover the following areas;

<b>Location and accessibility</b> – Are there services and facilities within 400m of the site
<b>Site character and context</b> - Whether the site is Brownfield/ green field land, whether topographical characteristics of the site may present an obstacle to development, relationship with recognised settlements, whether development would have an impact on important views/vistas, and whether or not there would be potential adverse impact from adjoining land uses. Potential contamination and existing use.
<b>Accessibility and highway capacity</b> - considering the suitability of vehicular access to the site, location of the site with regard to public transport routes, and accessibility by foot or cycle to a range of community facilities;
<b>Landscape and environmental impact</b> - Whether the site is subject to impacts on European, National or Local designations such as but not limited to; Special Area of Conservation (SAC); Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); Ramsar sites, Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); National Nature Reserves (NNRs); local, non-statutory designations such as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC); Landscape features/value such as green wedges and strategic landscape areas, historic assets; greenfield/brownfield site; agricultural land classification system (ALC) and air quality.
<b>Flood risk</b> - Is the site within a flood zone.
<b>Mineral safeguarding areas/buffer zones</b> - if the site is in a mineral safeguarding zone, what impact there would be on safeguarding areas and buffer zones.
<b>Infrastructure capacity</b> – Does the site benefit from existing infrastructure such as Water, drainage, sewerage, electric, gas and telecommunications connections and capacity.
<b>Deliverability and Suitability</b> - Does the site look broadly like it could realistically be developed and be genuinely suitable for development?
<b>Overall Conclusions of the Initial Candidate Site Assessment</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The site remains in the process</li> <li>2) Further information is required</li> <li>3) Remove the site from the process</li> </ol>
<b>For consideration not assessment - Planning history and legal agreements</b> – Current permission, any history of refusal, pre-application considerations, covenants.

- 4.7. This part of the process will allow judgements to be made on the sites against a series of objectives/questions divided into the above areas. It will be determined the level of impact that the proposed development will have upon each of these. The impact will be categorised against the **objectives/questions** as;

- Positive
- Further information required (request further information and judgment made)
- Negative

4.8. The impact will be categorised against the **section** areas as;

- The site appears to accord with this section
- Further consideration/ information is required regarding elements of this section
- The site does not appear to meet the aims of this section

4.9. There would be fundamental constraints associated with each section of the Initial Assessment. However, for example, some of the constraints that the Initial Assessment would identify, which would determine the filtering out of the site from further assessment stages for the particular proposal, would include;

- Sites that fall below the site size threshold for allocation (as set out above)
- Sites that contains fundamental constraints that cannot be mitigated. E.g. sites where vulnerable development is proposed in inappropriate flood risk zones.
- Sites which are unrelated to any settlement in the LDP settlement hierarchy, or appropriate levels of facilities.

4.10. An updated Candidate Site Register will be published alongside the Preferred Strategy at its consultation stage. The register will contain basic information about each site and the results of the stage 1 - Initial Assessment process. Initial accordance with the Preferred Strategy will also be indicated.

4.11. It is at this point that representations on the sites, including their role in helping to deliver the Strategy, along with proposing new sites, can be made. Comments on their assessment can also be submitted, along with further associated evidence. This will be considered as part of the next stage of the process as appropriate.

4.12. All representations made should be supported by a planning rationale and accord with the ISA framework.

### **RLDP Site Appraisal Sub Group and Site Visits**

4.13. A RLDP Site Appraisal Sub Group will be established as part of the Candidate Sites assessment process. They will firstly input their views at the Initial Assessment stage. The Sub-Group will consist of representatives from various

Council departments, including Countryside, Highways, Development Management, Education, Corporate Estates, Public Health and Flood Risk Management sections. Expertise from additional departments of the Council will also be consulted as necessary. These officers will bring their expertise to the assessment process, including necessary consideration of individual sites.

- 4.14. The Planning Policy Team, along with any necessary member of the above Site Appraisal Sub Group, may need to access the site to assess its features, as necessary.

## **Stage 2 – Integrated Sustainability Assessment**

- 4.15. The second stage of the process will allow the Council to undertake a more detailed assessment of the sites that have passed the stage 1 Initial Assessment. It will include assessment of the sites against the Integrated Sustainability Assessment (ISA) framework, to ensure that the sites contribute towards achieving the overall objectives of the plan. The ISA process will determine if the site has positive, neutral or negative impacts in the context of its environment, in relation to the objectives of the ISA. The ISA assesses all 'reasonable' options for a submitted site's inclusion within the Revised LDP. At the outset, this will be prepared by the environmental consultants, LUC.
- 4.16. This will be in alignment with the Scoping of the RLDP ISA process and the assessment of the Preferred Strategy. Accordingly, the sites will be fully assessed against the final Preferred Strategy.
- 4.17. If sites are determined to be contrary to the ISA, and ultimately to the objectives of the Plan and its Preferred Strategy, sites will be removed from the assessment process at this stage.

## **Stage 3 – Deliverability of Viable sites.**

- 4.18. This stage 3 assessment will determine if there is a necessary level of certainty associated with the site to allocate it for development in the Deposit RLDP. Success in this stage is primarily reliant on the assessment of the viability of a development scheme for the proposed use. It is expected that the promoter of the site should have, prior to this stage, submitted such viability evidence to enable the assessment to take place.
- 4.19. It should be made clear that until policy revision has taken place, (which will not happen prior to Deposit Stage), financial implications of a development scheme associated with Planning Obligations, will be those in the current, adopted LDP policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance. The current

Community Infrastructure Levy process in place in RCT should also be incorporated into any such assessments.

- 4.20. Furthermore, all development proposals should have the Statutory Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) incorporated as appropriate.
- 4.21. It is also necessary at this stage to further ensure the deliverability of sites in association with other, non-financial reasons e.g. ecology or access. Such site constraints may have been initially identified on a Candidate Site. Consideration of any further duly made representations or submissions of necessary and appropriate evidence to seek to overcome these constraints will also take place at this stage. The RLDP Site Appraisal Sub Group will be further utilised at this stage.

#### **Stage 4 - Consultation with Key Consultees (before draft deposit allocation)**

- 4.22. Sites that progress onto this stage 4 will be subject to consultation with relevant statutory consultees. These would include National Resource Wales, infrastructure providers such as (but not limited to) Dŵr Cymru/Welsh Water, the Local Health Board, National Grid, Natural Resources Wales, The Coal Authority, Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust, Wales and West Utilities, and Western Power Distribution. The LPA will kindly request that these bodies assess the sites and identify any potential issues, and if so, indicating whether or not mitigation measures can be put in place to overcome them.

## 5. **CONCLUSION**

- 5.1. Following the above stages, the most appropriate sites will be considered for their respective allocation in the RLDP. However, it should be acknowledged that it is perhaps inevitable that there will be a number of Candidate Sites submitted that may perform well against the assessment criteria, but will be omitted from the plan simply due to more appropriate land being available elsewhere. In such cases, there will also be the consideration of a list of potential substitute sites, if for whatever necessary reason other sites are taken out of the RLDP after the Deposit Stage.



## Appendix 1



# RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2020-2030

## CANDIDATE SITE SUBMISSION FORM

One of the initial stages of the Revised Local Development Plan (RLDP) is the 'Call for Candidate Sites'. The Council are now inviting the submission of Candidate Sites for their consideration for a range of development proposals.

One of the key principles of the Candidate Site process, is to gather suitable evidence from site promoters to robustly demonstrate that their sites are, or can be made, free from constraints, are in sustainable locations; and are deliverable whilst being financially viable for allocation.

This Candidate Site Submission Form has been prepared as part of the overarching Candidate Site Methodology for the RLDP process. That should be read prior to the completion of this form and the submission of Candidate Sites. It sets out the process in detail, what is expected to be submitted in relation to the site, (and when) and then sets out the multiple stages of assessment that sites will be subject to.

This site Submission Form is also accompanied by a detailed Guidance Note for its completion, which should be read in conjunction with the completion of this form.

Please complete one form for each site, or proposed use for each site. It must be accompanied by an Ordnance Survey base mapped plan at 1:1250 or 1:2500 scale, with a **red line boundary** outlining the land in question. Please also provide a **blue line boundary** outlining all other nearby parcels of land that are within the same ownership.

Box For Council Use Only	
Site ID	
Site Promoter ID	
Agent ID (if applicable)	
Date Received	
Date Input	

All submissions will be handled in accordance with GDPR regulations. Please note however that all forms and additional evidence submitted will be made available for public inspection. All completed Candidate Site Submission Forms and accompanying location plans must be submitted online, or sent to our email:

LDP@rctcbc.gov.uk or,

Planning Policy Team

Sardis House

Sardis Road

Pontypridd

CF37 1DU Tel: 01443 281129

**Deadline to submit Candidate Sites: 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021**

Please select your preferred method of communication for future information/consultations:

Email  Post

Please select your preferred language of communication:

Welsh  English

Corresponding in Welsh will not lead to delay.

### CONTACT DETAILS

1.	Contact details	Agents contact details (if applicable)
Title	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Name	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Company (if applicable)	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Address	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Post Code	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Email Address	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>

### SITE DETAILS

2. Site Name:	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>						
3. Site Address (including OS Grid Reference or Eastings/Northings, and edged red on an accompanying Ordnance Survey Plan):	<input style="width: 95%; height: 60px;" type="text"/>						
	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Grid Reference</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 70%;"><input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/></td> </tr> </table>	Grid Reference	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>				
	Grid Reference	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>					
	or						
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Easting</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 70%;"><input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Northing</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black;"><input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/></td> </tr> </table>	Easting	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	Northing	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>			
Easting	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>						
Northing	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>						
4. Site Area (Hectares):	<input style="width: 95%; height: 40px;" type="text"/>						
5. Site Type (tick one):	<table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Greenfield</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Brownfield</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Mixed</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Greenfield	Brownfield	Mixed	<input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/>
Greenfield	Brownfield	Mixed					
<input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/>					
6. Current Use(s):	<input style="width: 95%; height: 30px;" type="text"/>						

- 7. Proposed Use(s):
  
- 8. Brief description of proposal (e.g. estimated number of dwellings, commercial floorspace, MW of renewable energy, etc.):

**OWNERSHIP**

- |   | Yes                      | No                       |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 9. Is the site, and its proposed access, wholly in the ownership of the site promoter?                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If not, are all other land owners in support of this submission?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Is/are the land owner(s) willing to sell the land?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Is there a meaningful uplift in land value, sufficient to encourage the landowner to sell for the proposed use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Does the site promoter own any additional land adjacent to the site?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If multiple landowners are involved, please indicate if this is related to parts of the site or if there are several owners of the same area of land. Ordnance Survey Plans indicating this would be welcomed. All other landowners associated with the site who wish to be informed directly of the site’s progress, should be included above, or correspond with us directly.

**PLANNING STATUS AND SITE SURVEYS**

- 13. Is the site allocated within the current Local Development Plan, either partially or in its entirety?
  
- 14. Current Planning Status (if applicable):
  
- 15. Site Planning History (including any planning permissions granted or reasons for refusal):

- 16. Have any pre-application discussions taken place with the Council, including a formal pre-application? If so, please provide details.
  
- 17. If the site has been subject to a planning application or pre-application, what surveys were required? Please provide details and copies of any surveys that have been undertaken to date.

**LOCATION AND ACCESSIBILITY**

- |   | Yes                      | No                       | Further comments |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 18. Is the site within 400m of key services and facilities (e.g. schools, convenience stores, supermarkets, health care, play area, community facilities)? If yes, please give details. If no, what is the distance to the nearest?                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                  |
| 19. Is the site within 400m of green space, public open space or open access land? If yes, please give details. If no, what is the distance to the nearest?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                  |
| 20. Is the site within 400m of an existing Retail Centre, as defined in the Current Local Development Plan and illustrated on the associated proposals map? If yes, which centre(s) is it within 400m of? If no, what is the nearest centre and the distance to it? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                  |

**SITE CHARACTER AND CONTEXT**

- |  | Yes                      | No                       | Further details |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| 21. Does the site have any physical constraints?           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                 |
| 22. Is the site affected by conflicting neighbouring uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                 |
| 23. Is the site subject to any other key constraints?      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                 |

24. Do any public rights of way cross the site?

**ACCESSIBILITY AND HIGHWAY CAPACITY**

- |   | Yes                      | No                       | Further details   |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 25. Is the site currently accessible from the existing highway network? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input style="width: 100%; height: 40px;" type="text"/> |

If not, please explain what infrastructure is needed to deliver the site, and demonstrate how access could be achieved:

- |  |                          |                          |   |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 26. Is there funding/finance to deliver the necessary infrastructure requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input style="width: 100%; height: 40px;" type="text"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|

- |  |                          |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 27. Is the site within 400m of an existing or planning active travel route? Please specify the distance to the nearest identified active travel route. If no, what opportunities exist for promoting active travel within and around the site and linking into the existing network? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input style="width: 100%; height: 100px;" type="text"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

- |   |                          |                          |  |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 28. Is the site within 400m of a frequent bus service/train service? If yes, please provide details including the frequency of services using the bus stop or rail station. If no, what is the distance to the nearest bus stop or rail station? Please provide details of any liaison with public transport operators to improve public transport access to/from the site. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input style="width: 100%; height: 150px;" type="text"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

**LANDSCAPE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

- |   | Yes                      | No                       | Further details   |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 29. Is there a risk that the site is contaminated or within an Air Quality Management Area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input style="width: 100%; height: 40px;" type="text"/> |
| 30. Is the site affected by our area's coal mining legacy?                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input style="width: 100%; height: 30px;" type="text"/> |

31. Is the site within a Conservation Area?
32. Would the proposal affect a heritage asset? (Such as a listed building).
33. Is the site located on grade 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land?
34. Is the site within a designated landscape area such as a Green Wedge or Special Landscape Area?
35. Will the site include Green Infrastructure or provide areas of habitat connectivity?
36. Would the site impact on any national, regional or local environmental designations? Please tick all that apply:
- |  |                          |   |                          |
|--|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Special Area of Conservation (SAC)                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other  | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |                          |

**FLOOD RISK**

- |  | Yes                      | No                       | Further Details  |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 37. Does the site fall (wholly or partially) within a C1 or C2 flood risk zone (Zone 3 within the new TAN15), or within a High or Medium surface water and ordinary watercourse flood risk zone (Zone 3 within the new TAN15)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input style="width: 250px; height: 40px;" type="text"/> |

**MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREAS & BUFFER ZONES**

- |   | Yes                      | No                       | Further Details  |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 38. Is the site within an existing minerals safeguarding area or buffer zone? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input style="width: 250px; height: 40px;" type="text"/> |

### INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY

39. Please tell us which of the following utilities are available to the site:

Mains Water Supply	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mains Sewerage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Electrical Supply	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gas Supply	<input type="checkbox"/>
Landline Telephone	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fibre Broadband	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify): e.g. Electric Vehicle charging point

Please provide any further details:

### DELIVERABILITY AND VIABILITY

	Yes	No	Please provide further information:
40. If you are the landowner, do you intend to develop the site yourself?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
41. If you intend to develop the site yourself, is funding in place to cover development costs (e.g. grant funding, secured loan, bank facility)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
42. Have there been any discussions with potential developers to date?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
43. Is a developer on board, via an option agreement or another contractual agreement? If not, at what point is a developer likely to be on board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
44. Is the site able to accommodate the broad policy requirements to be delivered via CIL and/or S106 obligations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
45. Is the site generally able to provide for and comply with the Statutory Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



46. With all factors considered, is the site financially viable and deliverable?
47. Have you produced a viability assessment for your Candidate Site?
48. If planning permission were in place now, is the site immediately available for development?
49. Are there any restrictive covenants, legal agreements or claw back values relating to the use of the site?
50. Please indicate an approximate timescale for site delivery: For residential schemes, using the timescale below, please give an indication of when development might start and how many houses could be built each year.

2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
2026	2027	2028	2029	2030

**All and any supplementary supporting evidence is welcomed to be submitted with your Candidate Site. However, it should be particularly noted that where you have identified that your site does not fully accord with the submission and assessment criteria, further evidence should be submitted to indicate how these shortfalls, effects or constraints, can be overcome. Further information may also be sought by the Council where it is determined necessary and appropriate to enable the site to be considered in further stages of the Candidate Site assessment process. These requirements, and those relating to the level of detail of supporting evidence required (particularly for evidencing the deliverability and viability of your sites), are set out in the Candidate Site Methodology.**

**It should be noted that the submission of Candidate Sites, nor its acceptance as being duly made, must not in any way be construed as a commitment to its suitability for inclusion within the plan.**

## Appendix 2

### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Revised Local Development Plan 2020-2030

### Candidate Site Submission Form Guidance Notes, October 2020

#### Background and Purpose of the Guidance Notes

These Guidance Notes have been prepared in conjunction with the Candidate Site Submission Form. The details of both originate in the overarching Candidate Site Methodology for the RLDP process. The Methodology should be read prior to the submission of Candidate Sites as it firstly sets out the Candidate Sites process in detail, outlines what is expected to be submitted in relation to the site, (and when) and then sets out the multiple stages of assessment that sites will be subject to.

These Guidance Notes provide detailed advice on how to complete the Candidate Site Submission Form.

The Call for Candidate Sites begins in October 2020. All Candidate Site Submissions, along with any supporting evidence, will need to be submitted by 17:00 on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020. All information should be submitted on line or sent to:

[LDP@rctcbc.gov.uk](mailto:LDP@rctcbc.gov.uk)

Alternatively, hard copies can be mailed to:

The Planning Policy Team  
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council  
Floor 2  
Sardis House  
Sardis Road  
Pontypridd  
CF37 1DU.

If you have further queries on how to complete the submission form or the Candidate Site process in general (after reading the Methodology and these Guidance Notes) please do not hesitate to contact the Planning Policy Team who will be available to assist you. Officers can be contacted (preferably) via email at [LDP@rctcbc.gov.uk](mailto:LDP@rctcbc.gov.uk) or via telephone on 01443 281129.

**In accordance with the LDP Regulations, submitted sites will be made available for public inspection, and consequently cannot be treated as confidential. Data will however be handled in a manner that is GDPR compliant.**

## Candidate Site Submission Form: What to Include

The following Guidance Notes have been produced in order to allow site promoters to complete the submission form as comprehensively as possible and follows the structure of the form itself.

A separate form must be completed for each individual site or type of proposal on each site. As a minimum, the submission should comprise of:

- A complete Candidate Site Submission form;
- An up-to-date plan, on an Ordnance Survey base map, at scale 1:1250 or 1:2500. The site boundary must be outlined in **red**, with any additional land within the same ownership outlined in **blue**. Plans may be purchased directly from the Ordnance Survey website, a link for which is provided below: [www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk](http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk)

### Communication Preferences

The site promoter will need to specify their communication preferences on the form. This will include indicating whether correspondence is preferred in Welsh or English, and via email or letter.

### Contact Details (Question 1)

The site promoter will need to submit all relevant contact details on the Candidate Site Submission form. This data will be stored in a manner that is GDPR compliant.

Please note if an agent is nominated on the form, all correspondence will be sent directly to the agent, as opposed to the site promoter.

### Site Name and Address (Questions 2-3)

If the site has an existing name, please provide it here. If not, please provide a name associated with the locality, a nearby address or the site's previous use. If the site has no name but lies directly off a named road, state 'land to the [direction] of the [road]'.

### Site Plan

Please provide an up-to-date plan, on an Ordnance Survey base map, at scale 1:1250 or 1:2500. The site boundary must be outlined in **red**, with any additional land within the same ownership outlined in **blue**. Additionally, please specify the OS Grid Reference or provide Eastings/Northings to indicate the site's location.

Eastings and Northings are demonstrated on the Council's interactive map, available at: <http://www.cartogold.co.uk/rhondda/Rhondda.htm>. (Once the site has been located, place the cursor in the centre of the site and provide the six digit numbers (up to the decimal point) for each (displaying in the top left corner)).

#### **Site Area (Hectares) (Question 4)**

The area of the proposed Candidate Site should be indicated in hectares (and no other measurement of area).

For residential Candidate Sites specifically, the minimum site threshold is either 10 dwellings, or a minimum site size of 0.3ha.

Smaller sites can be submitted to the process; these sites will be included in the Candidate Sites Register. Such sites **will not however be considered as Candidate Sites for specific allocation**. These sites will be considered as part of the settlement boundary review, or small 'windfall sites', Self Build development or noting that they could come forward at some point during the plan period, if appropriate for development.

There are no minimum thresholds for all other land use Candidate Site submissions.

#### **Greenfield/Brownfield (Question 5)**

The site promoter should also indicate whether the land is brownfield (previously developed land), greenfield or 'mixed', a combination of brownfield and greenfield. A definition of previously developed land can be found on page 38 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 10).

<https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-12/planning-policy-wales-edition-10.pdf>

#### **Current Use (Question 6)**

The submission should identify the existing land use for the proposed site. Such uses may include (but are not limited to) housing, employment, retail, leisure, community uses etc. Should the site have more than one land use (mixed-use), please specify the uses present.

#### **Proposed Use (Question 7)**

The submission should identify the proposed land use of the Candidate Site, or indicate whether the existing use is to be retained. Such proposed land uses may include (but are not limited to) housing, employment, retail, leisure, community uses mineral extraction, recycling, waste, tourism, renewable energy etc. If the site is proposed for mixed-use, please indicate the land uses to be included.

### **Brief Description of the Proposal (Question 8)**

The submission should include a brief description of the proposal for which the Candidate Site is being submitted.

Proposals for residential uses should indicate the number of dwellings to be accommodated on the site. Current LDP policy indicates that an overall density of a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) should be sought for sites in the Northern Strategy Area and 35dph for sites in the Southern Strategy Area. Reductions on these should be justified.

This may include also (but is not limited to) an indication of retail floorspace (in square metres) or the amount of MW (megawatts) a renewable energy proposal may generate.

To ascertain which strategy area your site falls within, please use the link to the Council's interactive map, below. (As the map's 'key' illustrates, the strategy area boundary is denoted by a black dotted line).

<http://www.cartogold.co.uk/rhondda/Rhondda.htm>

### **Ownership (Questions 9-12)**

The site promoter should indicate whether they own the site that is being submitted and the land required for access. If not, contact details of any and all site owners may be submitted, subject to them agreeing to this and to the process. A plan should illustrate ownership details, where multiple landowners are involved. All other landowners associated with the site who wish to be informed directly of the site's progress, should be included, or choose to correspond with us directly. The contact details of all landowners will be stored in a manner that is GDPR compliant. Where the site promoter does not own the proposed site, they should identify how its inclusion within the Revised LDP will be achieved.

For example, has a developer entered into an agreement with the landowner or vice versa? Has the landowner agreed to the potential development of the site, with or without any provisos? The site promoter should provide evidence of any agreements undertaken, to prove that the site is deliverable and can be considered for inclusion within the Revised LDP.

The site promoter should further indicate whether the land owner is willing to sell the land being proposed as a Candidate Site, and whether they believe there to be a meaning uplift value, sufficient to encourage the sale. Where the site promoter is not the landowner, they should provide details of any dialogue or agreements made with the landowner to date. Should the answer to either of these questions be 'no', the site promoter may wish to indicate how they propose to address the issue.

### **Planning Status and Site Surveys (Questions 13)**

Is the site allocated within the current Local Development Plan, either partially or in its entirety?

Details of all allocations within the current LDP can be found on the Council's interactive map, available at: <http://www.cartogold.co.uk/rhondda/Rhondda.htm>

### **Current Planning Status (Question 14)**

The submission should indicate whether there are any existing 'live' or extant planning consents on the proposed site. Full details including the application reference number should be provided. Where applicable, information should be provided to indicate why the site was not developed for its permitted use.

Applications after 2004 can be searched for using the Council's online search tool, available at: <https://planningonline.rctcbc.gov.uk/online-applications/>

### **Site Planning History (Question 15)**

The site promoter should indicate whether the site has previously been granted or refused planning permission. If the site has been refused permission, the reasons for refusal should be included. Where a site has previously been approved, full details including the application reference number should be provided.

### **Pre-application (Question 16)**

Where a formal pre-application has been made, the pre-application reference number should be provided, alongside a brief synopsis of the advice provided.

### **Site Surveys (Question 17)**

What surveys are required or are likely to be required? Have any surveys been undertaken as part of any previous application or has indication been given during formal or informal discussions with the Council regarding potential survey work that would need to be complete to develop the site? Examples include Ecology surveys, Flood consequences Assessment and Transport studies.

### **Location and Accessibility**

#### **Key Services and Facilities (Questions 18)**

Details will need to be provided regarding the proposed site's proximity to existing key services and facilities, such as (but not limited to) schools, convenience stores, supermarkets, health care and play areas. The form seeks to establish whether there

are any key services and facilities within 400 metres (five minutes' walk) of the site. Any facilities within this 400m radius should be stipulated on the Candidate Site Submission Form. The site promoter will need to indicate the distance to the nearest key services and facilities, if greater than the 400m stipulated and state what services they are.

### **Public, Green or Open Spaces (Question 19)**

Details will need to be provided regarding the proposed site's proximity to existing green, open spaces or open access land. The form seeks to establish whether there are any public green or open spaces within 400 metres (five minutes' walk) of the site. The site promoter will need to indicate the distance to the nearest open, green space or open access land, if greater than the 400m stipulated. Areas of Open Access Land can be viewed here: <http://lle.gov.wales/Catalogue?lang=en&text=Open%20access>

### **Proximity to Retail Centres (Question 20)**

The site promoter should indicate whether the site is within 400m of an existing retail centre, as defined in the Current Local Development Plan and illustrated on the associated proposals map. If there is a centre within 400m of the site, the site promoter should stipulate which centre(s) however where the site is not within 400m, the site promoter should stipulate the distance to and name of the nearest centre. The defined retail centres can be viewed on the Council's LDP proposals map, available at: <http://www.cartogold.co.uk/rhondda/>

## **Site Character and Context**

### **Physical Constraints (Question 21)**

The site promoter should stipulate whether there are any physical constraints on site that will need to be overcome. Such constraints may include (but are not limited to) existing structures (that need to be cleared prior to development), steep topography, site stability, or troublesome vegetation and/or invasive species (such as Japanese Knotweed). Details of the constraint should be provided, alongside any proposed solutions to overcome said constraint.

### **Conflicting Neighbouring Uses (Question 22)**

Details of any potentially conflicting or 'bad neighbouring uses' should be provided on the Candidate Site Submission Form. For residential proposals a 'bad neighbour', for example, may include various industry, major highways, power lines, major gas pipelines or if the land is deemed a fire hazard (through wildfire) or other general noise or air pollutants? Conflicting uses for heavy industry or quarry proposals could then conversely be existing residential areas.

Impacts to the proposal, along with any proposed solutions should also be detailed within the form.

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Business/LicencesandPermits/Pollutionrelatedlicences/EnvironmentalPermitting.aspx>

<https://naturalresources.wales/permits-and-permissions/check-for-a-permit-licence-or-exemption/?lang=en>

<http://extrium.co.uk/walesnoiseviewer.html>

### **Other Key Constraints (Question 23)**

The site promoter should indicate whether the site is subject to any other key constraints (e.g. landscape designations, minerals safeguarding, historical and archaeological designations)? Some of the information can be obtained on the Council's online interactive Local Development Plan map, available at: <http://www.cartogold.co.uk/rhondda/>, whilst the remainder of the information can be obtained via the **Constraints Map**, which may be accessed from the current website you are on - The Call for Candidate Sites and their Submission.

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/RelatedDocuments/Pdfs/ConstraintsMap.pdf>

### **Public Rights of Way (Question 24)**

The site promoter should indicate whether the proposed site contains any public rights of way. Information on public rights are available on the Council's website, here: [https://my.rctcbc.gov.uk/myRhondda.aspx?MapSource=RCT/AllMaps\\_english&StartEasting=299818&StartNorthing=191571&StartZoom=127500&Layers=PlanningApplications](https://my.rctcbc.gov.uk/myRhondda.aspx?MapSource=RCT/AllMaps_english&StartEasting=299818&StartNorthing=191571&StartZoom=127500&Layers=PlanningApplications)

Or alternatively, the layers can be obtained from Natural Resources Wales, using the following link:

<https://naturalresources.wales/days-out/recreation-and-access-policy-advice-and-guidance/managing-access/public-rights-of-way/?lang=en>

### **Accessibility and Highways Capacity**

#### **Current Accessibility (Question 25)**

The site promoter should state whether or not the site is accessible from an existing highway network, and what grade of Highway. If this is not the case, the site promoter will need to state what infrastructure is needed to deliver the site, and demonstrate on a separate, accompanying plan how access could be achieved.

If third party land is required in order to achieve access, details should be included of any contact made with that third party landowner. The third party should be contactable to confirm any agreements.



### **Funding/Finance (Question 26)**

The site promoter should indicate whether they have the necessary finance or funding in place to deliver the site infrastructure required. Details of funding to cover infrastructure costs should be provided to the Council, where they are in place. Where no arrangements have been made, the landowner should specify how they intend to secure finance/funding.

### **Active Travel Routes (Question 27)**

Details will need to be provided regarding the proposed site's proximity to either existing or planned Active Travel Routes. The form seeks to establish whether there are (or will be) any active travel routes within 400 metres (five minutes' walk) of the site. The site promoter will need to indicate the distance to the nearest Active Travel Route, even if greater than the 400m stipulated. The Council's active travel network map (with existing and planned routes) can be accessed utilising the link below:

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/ParkingRoadsandTravel/Travel/ActiveTravelandCycling.aspx>

### **Public Transport (Question 28)**

Details will also need to be provided regarding the proposed site's proximity to existing bus stops and rail stations. The form seeks to establish whether there are any public transport services within 400 metres (five minutes' walk). It should be stated which facilities the site is in proximity to and what areas that they serve. Information should be provided regarding the frequency of the bus and/or train services and whether there are obstacles en route to accessing the public transport such as lack of pavements or a steep hill. The site promoter will need to indicate the distance to the nearest public transport facilities, if greater than the 400m stipulated and indicate which facilities they are.

### **Landscape and Environmental Impact**

#### **Contamination (Question 29)**

If there is a risk of any part of the site being proposed containing contaminated land, the site promoter should provide the Council with details of the potential source of said contamination.

Land can be contaminated by (this list is non-exhaustive):

- Heavy metals, such as arsenic, cadmium and lead
- Oils and tars
- Chemical substances and preparations, like solvents
- Gases
- Asbestos
- Radioactive substances

What counts as 'contaminated land'?

Land is legally defined as 'contaminated land' where substances are causing or could cause:

- Significant harm to people, property or protected species
- Significant pollution of surface waters (for example lakes and rivers) or groundwater
- Harm to people as a result of radioactivity

Contaminated land may previously have been used as (but would not be limited to) a:

- Factory
- Mine
- Steel mill
- Refinery
- Landfill

The Council has a non- public Contaminated Land Register that will be used to assess the site.

Further considerations can be seen below

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Business/LicencesandPermits/Pollutionrelatedlicences/EnvironmentalPermitting.aspx>

<https://naturalresources.wales/permits-and-permissions/check-for-a-permit-licence-or-exemption/?lang=en>

Air Quality Management Areas are declared by the Council via Order under Section 83(1) of the Environment Act 1995. In response to breaches of the Air Quality Objectives for Nitrogen Dioxide, there are currently sixteen Air Quality Management Areas within Rhondda Cynon Taf, further details can be found;

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Business/LicencesandPermits/Pollutionrelatedlicences/Airquality.aspx>

<http://extrium.co.uk/walesnoiseviewer.htmlhttps://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/maps/>

<https://airquality.gov.wales/>

### **Coal Mining Legacy (Question 30)**

The site promoter should indicate whether the site falls within a high coal mining risk area. This information can be obtained from the Coal Authority at the following; <https://mapapps2.bgs.ac.uk/coalauthority/home.html> or from the constraints-style map that the Council has produced to assist site promoters with the Candidate Site process. Other site specific coal mining legacy constraints should be identified as appropriate.

### **Conservation Area (Question 31)**

The site promoter should state whether the site falls within a designated Conservation Area. This information can be obtained from the Council's online map, available on the Council's website at:

[https://my.rctcbc.gov.uk/myRhondda.aspx?MapSource=RCT/AllMaps\\_english&StartEasting=299818&StartNorthing=191571&StartZoom=127500&Layers=PlanningApplications](https://my.rctcbc.gov.uk/myRhondda.aspx?MapSource=RCT/AllMaps_english&StartEasting=299818&StartNorthing=191571&StartZoom=127500&Layers=PlanningApplications)

and on the **Constraints Map**, which may be accessed from the current website you are on - The Call for Candidate Sites and their Submission.

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/RelatedDocuments/Pdfs/ConstraintsMap.pdf>

### **Heritage Asset (Question 32)**

The site promoter should indicate whether the site affects an existing heritage asset, such as a listed building. This information can be found on the Council's interactive map, available on the Council's website, utilising the following link: [https://my.rctcbc.gov.uk/myRhondda.aspx?MapSource=RCT/AllMaps\\_english&StartEasting=299818&StartNorthing=191571&StartZoom=127500&Layers=PlanningApplications](https://my.rctcbc.gov.uk/myRhondda.aspx?MapSource=RCT/AllMaps_english&StartEasting=299818&StartNorthing=191571&StartZoom=127500&Layers=PlanningApplications).

### **Agricultural Land (Question 33)**

The site promoter should state whether the proposal would result in the loss of grade 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land. The classification of agricultural land to be lost should be stipulated on the Candidate Site Submission Form (even if the site falls into a lower agricultural classification). The site promoter should also indicate whether the land is currently in use for agricultural purposes, along with the amount of agricultural land likely to be lost. Further information on agricultural land classifications can be located on the Welsh Government's website, using the following link:

<https://gov.wales/agricultural-land-classification>.

### **Green wedge/Special Landscape Area (Question 34)**

The site promoter should indicate whether the site is within a Green Wedge or a Special Landscape Area in the Current Local Development Plan and illustrated on the associated proposals map. The Green Wedges and Special Landscape Areas can be viewed on the Council's LDP proposals map, available at: <http://www.cartogold.co.uk/rhondda/>

### **Green Infrastructure/Habitat Connectivity (Question 35)**

The site promoter should indicate whether they intend to contribute to the network of green infrastructure or habitat connectivity by providing land for such purposes, as part

of any proposed development of the Candidate Site. If so, the site promoter should provide details of their intentions.

### **National, Regional or Local Environmental Designations (Question 36)**

It should be indicated whether the site falls into any of the following: a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC); a Special Area of Conservation (SAC); a Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS); a Local Nature Reserve (LNR); a Historic Park or Garden (HP/G); or whether there is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) anywhere within the site's 'red line boundary'. The site promoter should tick all that apply on the Candidate Site Submission Form. The constraints map can be used to determine whether any such designations affect your Candidate Site, this is available on our **Constraints Map**, which may be accessed from the current website you are on - The Call for Candidate Sites and their Submission.

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/RelatedDocuments/Pdfs/ConstraintsMap.pdf>

### **Flood Risk**

#### **Flood Risk (Question 37)**

The site promoter should indicate whether the site wholly or partially falls within a C1 or C2 flood risk zone. Furthermore, it should be determined whether the site wholly or partially fall within a High or Medium surface water and ordinary watercourse flood risk zone. The appropriate information indicating this floodrisk may be found at the following location;

<https://naturalresources.wales/evidence-and-data/maps/long-term-flood-risk/?lang=en>

In accordance with national planning policy, new development should be directed away from C1 and C2 flood zones, towards suitable land within Zone A, or otherwise Zone B (where river flooding is less of an issue). Highly vulnerable development (such as residential) and Emergency Services will not be permitted in a C2 flood risk zone, and will therefore not be allocated within them. Other Candidate Sites within a C1 or C2 flood risk zone must prove that they are acceptable in principle, as such, they must be supported by a Flood Consequences Assessment (FCA). The FCA will identify the consequences of the development and how it can be managed to an acceptable level, without causing further flooding issues or having a detrimental impact elsewhere.

Technical Advice Note 15 is available on the Welsh Government's website and can be accessed using the link below.

<https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-09/tan15-development-flood-risk.pdf>

The Council is not responsible for assessing the acceptability of any Flood Consequences Assessment submitted. FCAs should be acceptable to Natural Resources Wales (NRW), who will form part of the Candidate Site Assessment process. The Council may also, at any time, request further information or evidence during the Candidate Site process. Particularly where consultation responses raise issues such as tidal, fluvial or surface water flooding and the associated impacts of climate change.

It should be noted that WG and RCT stance on floodrisk is currently evolving. TAN 15 is due to be updated soon with a Local Flood Risk Strategy also coming forward. Assessment of sites will be made in accordance with the most up to date adopted policy.

## **Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Buffer Zones**

### **Existing Minerals Safeguarding Area (Question 38)**

The site promoter should indicate whether their Candidate Sites falls within a mineral safeguarding area. If so, it should be stated whether the development would cause an unacceptable sterilisation of the mineral? The mineral safeguarding zones are available on the Council's interactive map, using the following link: <http://www.cartogold.co.uk/rhondda/> and on the **Constraints Map**, which may be accessed from the current website you are on - The Call for Candidate Sites and their Submission.

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/RelatedDocuments/Pdfs/ConstraintsMap.pdf>

### **Minerals Buffer Zone (Question 38)**

The site promoter should indicate whether the site falls within a minerals buffer zone for the aggregate quarries in RCT i.e. Craig yr Hesg Quarry, Pontypridd, Hendy Quarry, Miskin, Pontyclun, or Forest Wood Quarry, Pontyclun. If so, the name or reference of the buffer zone should be stipulated on the Candidate Site Submission Form. The mineral buffer zones can be viewed on the **Constraints Map**, which may be accessed from the current website you are on - The Call for Candidate Sites and their Submission.

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/RelatedDocuments/Pdfs/ConstraintsMap.pdf>

## **Infrastructure Capacity**

### **Utilities (Question 39)**

The relevant boxes should be ticked to indicate whether the site is served by the following services: Mains water supply, mains sewerage, electrical supply, gas supply, landline telephone and/or broadband. Any existing Electric Vehicle charging points on site should be noted also. Any other form of service should be stipulated in the box provided. Should utility provision not be available currently at the site, the site promoter should explain how access to such services will be achieved.

## **Deliverability and Viability**

### **Landowner Intentions (Question 40)**

If the site promoter is the current landowner, it should be signified whether or not it is their intention to develop the site. If not, details of discussions with any developers should be provided.

### **Funding/Finance (Question 41)**

Details of funding to cover all development costs should be provided to the Council, where they are in place. Where no arrangements have been made, the landowner should specify how they intend to secure finance/funding (e.g. grant funding, secured bank loan, bank facility).

### **Discussions with Potential Developers (Question 42)**

The form seeks to ascertain whether any discussions have taken place with potential developers. Should this be the case, the site promoter will need to provide details of any discussions held.

### **Developer (Question 43)**

The site promoter should state whether or not there is a developer on board with whom they have entered into an options agreement or some other contractual agreement. If so, details should be provided to the Council. If no, the site promoter should indicate at what point there is likely to be developer involvement.

### **Policy Obligations (Question 44)**

The site promoter should provide an indication of whether the site is able to be delivered whilst accommodating full policy requirements, in relation to CIL (the Community Infrastructure Levy) and/or Section 106 obligations? Information about the Community Infrastructure Levy can be found on the Council's website here:

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/CommunityInfrastructureLevy/CommunityInfrastructureLevy.aspx>

The existing policy requirements can be found within the LDP document, and accompanying Supplementary Planning Guidance available at:

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/LocalDevelopmentPlans/LocalDevelopmentPlan20062021.aspx> (Scroll down and click on the 'Adopted Local Development Plan' link).

The Council's SPG can be found here:

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/LocalDevelopmentPlans/SupplementaryPlanningGuidance.aspx>

### **Sustainable Drainage Systems (Question 45)**

Issues such as the topography (e.g. Is the site sloping at greater than 1:20), land conditions and previous land uses of the site (contaminated land, reworked tip material, made ground), high groundwater table, environmentally sensitive areas and the development proposal itself would have impacts on whether SUDs can be utilised on the site – or the options available for them. Multiple constraints would clearly have a greater impact. These general site characteristics should be identified at the submission stage.

However, the incorporation of SUDs in the development would be considered further at the Viability/Deliverability Stage 3 assessment, in conjunction with the Council officers who maintain the function of the Sustainable Drainage Approval Body. For information, the Statutory Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), as set out for RCT in the following location;

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/ParkingRoadsandTravel/Roadspavementsandpaths/SustainableDrainage/SustainableDrainageAnOverview.aspx>

### **Viability (Question 46)**

It should be indicated, with all things considered, whether or not the site is deemed to be viable for development. Please be aware that a full viability assessment will be required prior to any allocation of a site. This is considered further in the Candidate Site Methodology.

### **Viability Assessment (Question 47)**

The site promoter should specify whether a viability assessment has been undertaken on the proposed site and its associated scheme. If so, a copy of the assessment should be submitted to the Council with the Candidate Site Submission Form.

**Site Availability (Question 48)**

If the site had planning permission in place, as of this moment, would the site be immediately available for development? The site promoter will need to provide details of any barriers that would prevent the site coming forward immediately, assuming that all necessary permissions have been granted.

**Restrictive Covenants, Legal Agreements or Claw Back Values (Question 49)**

It should be indicated on the Candidate Site Submission Form whether the site has any known covenants or other restrictions on any part of the land within the site boundary. If any such restrictions have been placed upon the land, details should be provided to the Council. The site promoter should also specify how the restriction will impact upon the proposal, as well as offering any solutions to overcome the restriction.

**Approximate Timescales (Question 50)**

Please indicate (in the table provided in the Candidate Site Submission Form) an approximate timescale for the delivery of your Candidate Site. Try to be as realistic as possible when considering when the site might reasonably be ready to come forward. (the time taken to obtain planning permission should be incorporated into this forecast). For solely residential proposals, please provide an indication of when development may commence and the approximate number of houses to be built per annum, according to your proposed development schedule.

**Additional Information**

Please provide any further relevant information that has not been covered by previous questions, but is still pertinent to your submission.

**The responsibility of undertaking relevant technical work to support a site's inclusion in the plan, including any and all financial costs, resides solely with the site promoter.**

All and any supplementary supporting evidence is welcomed to be submitted with your Candidate Site. However, it should be particularly noted that where you have identified that your site does not fully accord with the submission and assessment criteria, further evidence should be submitted to indicate how these shortfalls, effects or constraints, can be overcome. Further information may also be sought by the Council where it is determined necessary and appropriate to enable the site to be considered in further stages of the Candidate Site assessment process. These requirements, and those relating to the level of detail of supporting evidence required (particularly for evidencing the deliverability and viability of your sites), are set out in the Candidate Site Methodology.



**It should be noted that the submission of Candidate Sites, nor its acceptance as being duly made, must not in any way be construed as a commitment to its suitability for inclusion within the plan.**

**Appendix 3****Candidate Site Assessment  
Stage One - Initial Assessment****1. Site Size threshold**

- 1) The site is 0.3ha or greater (Candidate site)
- 2) The site is less than 0.3ha (Settlement boundary site, small windfall site or self-build)

Stage outcome – Sites of less than 0.3 ha are removed from the full Candidate Site process but may still be considered for inclusion in the settlement boundary or considered as an appropriate small windfall site/self-build.

**Location and accessibility**

**2. Is the site within 400m of an existing retail centre, as defined in the current Local Development Plan (LDP) (as illustrated on the LDP Proposals map) and other key facilities such as Primary and Secondary Schools? If yes, which centre(s) is it within 400m of? If no, what is the nearest centre and what distance is it? Is the site within 400m of other key services and facilities such as schools, health facilities, community facilities etc.?**

- 1) Yes, the site is within 400m of a retail centre and or other key services (Retail centres as define by the current LDP and illustrated on the proposals map and schools etc)
- 2) There are limited services and facilities in the area or the distance to Retail Centres or other facilities is greater than 400m. Some further consideration and information required (not a retail centre but some services and facilities, close to a school or cluster of shops).
- 3) There are no services and facilities within 400m of the site (isolated and with nothing around it).

**3. Is the site related to an existing settlement?**

- 1) Yes, the site is related to an existing settlement (in the current LDP settlement hierarchy)
- 2) The site is related to some development but not in the settlement hierarchy (e.g. Groesfaen)

- 3) The site is in an isolated location unrelated to an existing settlement (the site is in the Countryside)

**Conclusion of this section:**

- The site appears to accord with this section
- Further consideration/ information is required regarding elements of this section
- The site does not appear to meet the aims of this section

**Site character and context** – Whether the site is brownfield/greenfield land, whether topographical characteristics or physical development on the site may present an obstacle to development, whether development would have an impact on important views/vistas, and whether or not there would be potential adverse impact from adjoining land uses. Potential contamination and existing use.

**4. Is the site brownfield or greenfield?**

- 1) Brown (as per definition in PPW)
- 2) Mixed
- 3) Green (as per definition in PPW)

**5. Are there any physical constraints on the site that could present an obstacle to development?**

- 1) No
- 2) Further investigation and information required
- 3) Yes

**6. Would development on the site have an impact upon important views/vistas?**

- 1) No
- 2) Further investigation and information required.
- 3) Yes

**7. Would there be any adverse impact arising from potentially conflicting adjoining land uses?** (heavy industry, landfill, quarry, close to a road for example which may need a study to quantify, or fire risk such as a bracken hillside, noise, air, rivers)

- 1) No conflicting land uses
- 2) Further investigation and information is required
- 3) Yes, there would be an adverse impact arising from conflicting land uses.

**Conclusion of this section:**

- The site appears to accord with this section
- Further consideration/ information is required regarding elements of this section
- The site does not appear to meet the aims of this section

**Accessibility and highway capacity** – considering the suitability of the site with regard to accessibility by foot or cycle to a range of community facilities; public transport routes and the suitability of vehicular access to the site

**8. Is the site within 400m of an RCT (or neighbouring Authority) existing or planned Active Travel Route?** Please specify the distance to the nearest identified active travel route

- 1) Yes
- 2) Further investigation and information required/Improvements needed
- 3) No

**9. Is the site accessible to the wider area on foot?**

- 1) The site has a good accessibility on foot (there is a good network of uninterrupted, good quality pavements which are well lit and promote walking)
- 2) The site requires further investigation regarding access on foot (some improvements may be required such as improvements to interruptions in the pavement network but these seem feasible)
- 3) The site has no viable access on foot (the site is in an isolated location, where access on foot is very difficult, if not impossible).

**10. Is the site within 400m and accessible to suitable levels of green space, green infrastructure network, public open space or open access land?**

- 1) Yes
- 2) Further information required, improvements required for access, or greater distance to facilities.
- 3) No

**11. Is the site located within walking distance (i.e. 400m) of an existing bus stop or railway station)?** (Please specify if steep/obstructed access route).

- 1) The site is within 400m of a frequent (at least every 30 minutes during the daytime and evening) mode of public transport via an accessible route (easy access to one or more frequent public transport modes, with good access)
- 2) The site has some access to public transport (not within 400m but within a 'reasonable' distance, transport not frequent or subject to an obstructed route (steep, interruptions in pavement network)

- 3) There is no frequent mode of public transport within 400m.

**12. Does the site have suitable vehicle access?** (Subject to consultation with Highways colleagues)

- 1) There is suitable vehicle access to the site (no highways objection)
- 2) Proposals for improvements to the vehicle access of the site are required (no access at present but could be achieved with improvements)
- 3) There is no suitable access solution to the site.

**Conclusion of this section:**

- The site appears to accord with this section
- Further consideration/ information is required regarding elements of this section
- The site does not appear to meet the aims of this section

**Landscape and environmental impact** – Whether the site is subject to or impacts on European, National or Local designations such as but not limited to: Special Area of Conservation (SAC); Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); Ramsar sites; National Nature Reserves (NNRs); local, non-statutory designations such as proposed Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (PSINC); Landscape features/value such as green wedges and Special Landscape Areas, historic assets; greenfield/brownfield site; agricultural land classification system (ALC) and air quality. Please note that for SINC designations the Proposed SINC maps appearing on the constraints map will be used for determination. For designations such as Green Wedges and SLAs the current proposals map will be used.

**13. Is the site within, or could it have a potential impact on, a European, National or Local ecological designation? (Subject to consultation with Ecology)**

- 1) No designation or indirect impacts (there is nothing on the site)
- 2) Yes, but mitigation may be possible
- 3) Yes, and mitigation is not possible (the site is in a designation and mitigation is determined as not possible, there would be unacceptable harm to the feature of the designation)

**14. Would development on the site result in the loss of agricultural land?**

- 1) No (not agricultural land).
- 2) Yes, but low quality or considered acceptable (as per guidance in PPW)
- 3) Yes, high quality (as per guidance in PPW)

**15. Is the site (or parts thereof) protected by landscape designations? (Green Wedge, Special Landscape Area?).**

- 1) No (the site is not within a landscape designation).
- 2) Yes – further information and assessment required (the site is in a landscape designation but further information is required regarding its impact – this is where we ask for a LVIA) or reconsideration of the designation required.
- 3) Yes – undermining impact on the designation (the site would create unacceptable harm/undermine the designation i.e. create coalescence of two settlements etc.)

**16. Is the site protected by, contains or impacts on any cultural designations (conservation areas, listed buildings, historic landscape)?**

- 1) No (there is no asset or designation which the site would impact on).
- 2) Yes – further information and assessment required (there may be an impact on the historic asset – a study would be needed)
- 3) Yes – there will be an undermining impact on the designation

**17. Is there a potential risk of contaminated land, coal mining legacy or within an Air Quality Management Area?**

- 1) No
- 2) Yes – further information required to ascertain the risk and mitigation required (an acceptable land contamination or air quality report will be required)
- 3) Yes – The site would pose an unacceptable risk to health (where public health confirms that there is an absolute constraint).

**Conclusion of this section:**

- The site appears to accord with this section
- Further consideration/ information is required regarding elements of this section
- The site does not appear to meet the aims of this section

**Flood risk****18. Is the site within a flood zone?**

- 1) No the site is not within a flood zone (not within any zone)
- 2) Yes, the site is in a flood zone but mitigation maybe possible (the site use and or flood zone mean that the TAN allows an FCA to establish acceptability – An FCA would be required here)
- 3) There is an unacceptable risk of flooding.

**Conclusion of this section:**

- The site appears to accord with this section
- Further consideration/ information is required regarding elements of this section
- The site does not appear to meet the aims of this section

**Mineral safeguarding areas/buffer zones****19. Is the site located within a mineral safeguarding area or quarry buffer zone?**

- 1) The site is not in a mineral safeguarding zone
- 2) The site is in a mineral safeguarding zone but the mineral is already sterilised (The mineral is already too close to other development or ecologically sensitive areas as per definition in the LDP CS10)
- 3) The site is in a mineral safeguarding zone and would possibly sterilise the mineral/The site is within a quarry buffer zone. (Further information regarding pre-extraction is required).

**Conclusion of this section:**

- The site appears to accord with this section
- Further consideration/ information is required regarding elements of this section
- The site does not appear to meet the aims of this section

**Deliverability and Suitability**

**20. Does the site look broadly like it could realistically be developed and be genuinely suitable for development?** This question will not be incorporated into the overall Initial Assessment but will play a role in indicating what further evidence is needed to allow further assessment of the site from this perspective.

- 1) The site appears to accord with the initial assessment
- 2) Further investigation/ information is required to establish if the site accords with the initial assessment
- 3) The site does not appear to accord with the initial assessment

**Overall Conclusions of the Initial Candidate Site Assessment**

- 1) The site remains in the process
- 2) Further information is required
- 3) Remove the site from the process

**The determination of the Initial Assessment will be made having given consideration to each of the sections above. Sites may be removed from the assessment process if they cannot accord with the requirements of one or more sections.**

**Consideration to be included on the database:**

**Planning history and legal agreements** – Current permission, any history of refusal, pre-application considerations, covenants.





Rhondda Cynon Taf

Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Diwygiedig 2020-2030

Revised Local Development Plan 2020-2030

# Candidate Site Submission Form

October 2020





## **RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2020-2030**

### **CANDIDATE SITE SUBMISSION FORM**

One of the initial stages of the Revised Local Development Plan (RLDP) is the 'Call for Candidate Sites'. The Council are now inviting the submission of Candidate Sites for their consideration for a range of development proposals.

One of the key principles of the Candidate Site process, is to gather suitable evidence from site promoters to robustly demonstrate that their sites are, or can be made, free from constraints, are in sustainable locations; and are deliverable whilst being financially viable for allocation.

This Candidate Site Submission Form has been prepared as part of the overarching Candidate Site Methodology for the RLDP process. That should be read prior to the completion of this form and the submission of Candidate Sites. It sets out the process in detail, what is expected to be submitted in relation to the site, (and when) and then sets out the multiple stages of assessment that sites will be subject to.

This site Submission Form is also accompanied by a detailed Guidance Note for its completion, which should be read in conjunction with the completion of this form.

Please complete one form for each site, or proposed use for each site. It must be accompanied by an Ordnance Survey base mapped plan at 1:1250 or 1:2500 scale, with a **red line boundary** outlining the land in question. Please also provide a **blue line boundary** outlining all other nearby parcels of land that are within the same ownership.

<b>Box For Council Use Only</b>	
Site ID	
Site Promoter ID	
Agent ID (if applicable)	
Date Received	
Date Input	

All submissions will be handled in accordance with GDPR regulations. Please note however that all forms and additional evidence submitted will be made available for public inspection. All completed Candidate Site Submission Forms and accompanying location plans must be submitted online, or sent to our email:

LDP@rctcbc.gov.uk or,

Planning Policy Team

Sardis House

Sardis Road

Pontypridd

CF37 1DU Tel: 01443 281129

**Deadline to submit Candidate Sites: 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021**

Please select your preferred method of communication for future information/consultations:

Email  Post

Please select your preferred language of communication:

Welsh  English

Corresponding in Welsh will not lead to delay.

## CONTACT DETAILS

1.	Contact details	Agents contact details (if applicable)
Title	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Name	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Company (if applicable)	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Address	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Post Code	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
Email Address	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>

## SITE DETAILS

2. Site Name:	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>		
3. Site Address (including OS Grid Reference or Eastings/Northings, and edged red on an accompanying Ordnance Survey Plan):			
	Grid Reference		
	or		
	Easting		
	Northing		
4. Site Area (Hectares):	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>		
5. Site Type (tick one):	Greenfield <input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield <input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/>	Mixed <input style="width: 30px; height: 25px;" type="checkbox"/>
6. Current Use(s):	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>		

7. Proposed Use(s):
8. Brief description of proposal (e.g. estimated number of dwellings, commercial floorspace, MW of renewable energy, etc.):

**OWNERSHIP**

- |   | Yes                      | No                       |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 9. Is the site, and its proposed access, wholly in the ownership of the site promoter?                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If not, are all other land owners in support of this submission?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Is/are the land owner(s) willing to sell the land?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Is there a meaningful uplift in land value, sufficient to encourage the landowner to sell for the proposed use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Does the site promoter own any additional land adjacent to the site?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If multiple landowners are involved, please indicate if this is related to parts of the site or if there are several owners of the same area of land. Ordnance Survey Plans indicating this would be welcomed. All other landowners associated with the site who wish to be informed directly of the site's progress, should be included above, or correspond with us directly.

**PLANNING STATUS AND SITE SURVEYS**

13. Is the site allocated within the current Local Development Plan, either partially or in its entirety?
14. Current Planning Status (if applicable):
15. Site Planning History (including any planning permissions granted or reasons for refusal):

16. Have any pre-application discussions taken place with the Council, including a formal pre-application? If so, please provide details.

17. If the site has been subject to a planning application or pre-application, what surveys were required? Please provide details and copies of any surveys that have been undertaken to date.

### LOCATION AND ACCESSIBILITY

	Yes	No	Further comments
18. Is the site within 400m of key services and facilities (e.g. schools, convenience stores, supermarkets, health care, play area, community facilities)? If yes, please give details. If no, what is the distance to the nearest?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
19. Is the site within 400m of green space, public open space or open access land? If yes, please give details. If no, what is the distance to the nearest?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
20. Is the site within 400m of an existing Retail Centre, as defined in the Current Local Development Plan and illustrated on the associated proposals map? If yes, which centre(s) is it within 400m of? If no, what is the nearest centre and the distance to it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### SITE CHARACTER AND CONTEXT

	Yes	No	Further details
21. Does the site have any physical constraints?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
22. Is the site affected by conflicting neighbouring uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
23. Is the site subject to any other key constraints?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

24. Do any public rights of way cross the site?

**ACCESSIBILITY AND HIGHWAY CAPACITY**

25. Is the site currently accessible from the existing highway network? **Yes**  **No**  **Further details**

If not, please explain what infrastructure is needed to deliver the site, and demonstrate how access could be achieved:

26. Is there funding/finance to deliver the necessary infrastructure requirements?

27. Is the site within 400m of an existing or planning active travel route? Please specify the distance to the nearest identified active travel route. If no, what opportunities exist for promoting active travel within and around the site and linking into the existing network?

28. Is the site within 400m of a frequent bus service/train service? If yes, please provide details including the frequency of services using the bus stop or rail station. If no, what is the distance to the nearest bus stop or rail station? Please provide details of any liaison with public transport operators to improve public transport access to/from the site.

**LANDSCAPE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

29. Is there a risk that the site is contaminated or within an Air Quality Management Area? **Yes**  **No**  **Further details**

30. Is the site affected by our area's coal mining legacy?

31. Is the site within a Conservation Area?
32. Would the proposal affect a heritage asset? (Such as a listed building).
33. Is the site located on grade 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land?
34. Is the site within a designated landscape area such as a Green Wedge or Special Landscape Area?
35. Will the site include Green Infrastructure or provide areas of habitat connectivity?
36. Would the site impact on any national, regional or local environmental designations? Please tick all that apply:
- |  |                          |   |                          |
|--|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Special Area of Conservation (SAC)                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other  | <input type="checkbox"/> |   |                          |

### FLOOD RISK

- |  | Yes                      | No                       | Further Details      |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 37. Does the site fall (wholly or partially) within a C1 or C2 flood risk zone (Zone 3 within the new TAN15), or within a High or Medium surface water and ordinary watercourse flood risk zone (Zone 3 within the new TAN15)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="text"/> |

### MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREAS & BUFFER ZONES

- |   | Yes                      | No                       | Further Details      |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 38. Is the site within an existing minerals safeguarding area or buffer zone? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="text"/> |



## INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY

39. Please tell us which of the following utilities are available to the site:

Mains Water Supply	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mains Sewerage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Electrical Supply	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gas Supply	<input type="checkbox"/>
Landline Telephone	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fibre Broadband	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify): e.g. Electric Vehicle charging point

Please provide any further details:

## DELIVERABILITY AND VIABILITY

	Yes	No	Please provide further information:
40. If you are the landowner, do you intend to develop the site yourself?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
41. If you intend to develop the site yourself, is funding in place to cover development costs (e.g. grant funding, secured loan, bank facility)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
42. Have there been any discussions with potential developers to date?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
43. Is a developer on board, via an option agreement or another contractual agreement? If not, at what point is a developer likely to be on board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
44. Is the site able to accommodate the broad policy requirements to be delivered via CIL and/or S106 obligations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
45. Is the site generally able to provide for and comply with the Statutory Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

46. With all factors considered, is the site financially viable and deliverable?
47. Have you produced a viability assessment for your Candidate Site?
48. If planning permission were in place now, is the site immediately available for development?
49. Are there any restrictive covenants, legal agreements or claw back values relating to the use of the site?

50. Please indicate an approximate timescale for site delivery: For residential schemes, using the timescale below, please give an indication of when development might start and how many houses could be built each year.

2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
2026	2027	2028	2029	2030

**All and any supplementary supporting evidence is welcomed to be submitted with your Candidate Site. However, it should be particularly noted that where you have identified that your site does not fully accord with the submission and assessment criteria, further evidence should be submitted to indicate how these shortfalls, effects or constraints, can be overcome. Further information may also be sought by the Council where it is determined necessary and appropriate to enable the site to be considered in further stages of the Candidate Site assessment process. These requirements, and those relating to the level of detail of supporting evidence required (particularly for evidencing the deliverability and viability of your sites), are set out in the Candidate Site Methodology.**

**It should be noted that the submission of Candidate Sites, nor its acceptance as being duly made, must not in any way be construed as a commitment to its suitability for inclusion within the plan.**

# **Rhondda Cynon Taff Revised Local Development Plan 2020 – 2030**

**Candidate Site: Western extension to Craig yr Hesg Quarry**

**Statement in Support of Candidate Site Submission**

**Hanson UK**

Final 24 March 2021

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 A 'Candidate Site Submission Form' has been completed in support of the re-allocation in the Revised Local Development Plan (LDP) of a Preferred Area of Known Minerals Resources for a western extension to Craig yr Hesg Quarry.
- 1.2 The existing adopted LDP makes provision for a western extension to the quarry within a 'Preferred Area of Known Mineral Resources' (ref Policy SSA25).
- 1.3 The accompanying text to Policy SSA25 (ref. para 6.184) confirms that Craig yr Hesg is the only operating sandstone quarry in RCT, and that the existing quarry currently produces high specification high polished stone value (PSV) or 'skid resistance' Pennant Sandstone. It notes that *"the resource is in high demand and is recognised as being an important high specification aggregate (HSA), i.e. a material suitable for the highly demanding use of road surfacing materials"* (ref para 6.184). The Plan also cross refers to the Regional Technical Statement (2008) which *"identifies the need to allocate additional rock reserves in Rhondda Cynon Taff, to ensure a supply of general hardstone resources over the period of the LDP...."*(ref para 6.185).
- 1.4 The allocation of the 'preferred area' as an extension to Craig yr Hesg Quarry is the only allocation of land for future aggregates production made in the LDP, which the Plan relies upon as part of RCTs contribution to regional supplies as required by Minerals Technical Advice Note 1: Aggregates (MTAN1) and the Regional Technical Statement (RTS), discussed below. Continuity of extraction at Craig yr Hesg Quarry thus represents the primary minerals strategy of RCT via the LDP. It follows that the release of the reserves at the Craig yr Hesg extension site is central to ensuring the required continuity of aggregate supply and the delivery of the LDP minerals strategy.
- 1.5 There have been no land use changes in circumstances which should prevent the 'Preferred Area of Known Mineral Resources' (Policy SSA25) being carried forward into policy in the Revised LDP.
- 1.6 It is recognised that an application was submitted in May 2015 for a western extension of the quarry workings into part of the area of land to which Policy SSA25 relates, and that the application was refused. However, it is important to note that the reason for refusal was not based upon any conflict with LDP policy or any concerns regarding the land use principle of the quarry extension development (nor should there have been in the context of policy in the development plan). The concern focused on a narrow issue of distances to sensitive property. This will be considered further via an appeal against the decision to refuse the application. However, for reasons discussed below, the principle of mineral extraction within the SSA25 policy area remains sound and the need for the release of additional mineral resources has been re-enforced by an updated RTS.

## 2.0 LDP Policy SSA25

- 2.1 As noted above, land adjacent to the western boundary of Craig yr Hesg Quarry is identified by Policy SSA25 as a 'Preferred Area of Known mineral Resources', with the defined area shown on the Proposals Map. The identified area is shown on plan ref c10m/131 accompanying this Statement.
- 2.2 In addition, policy AW14 seeks to safeguard mineral resources and defines a 200m buffer zone around the existing Craig yr Hesg Quarry and SSA25 area.
- 2.3 The May 2015 application defined a mineral extraction area as an extension to Craig yr Hesg Quarry within the confines of the Policy SSA25 area.
- 2.4 In determining the May 2015 application, the Planning Officer in his report to the RCT Planning and Development Committee in February 2020 concluded that:
- The area proposed for the extraction element of the extension is all within the boundaries of the area designated as a Preferred Area of Known Mineral Resource under Policy SSA 25 of the Local Development Plan. A significant section of the proposed engineered northern screening land form is outside this Preferred Area, but this is not considered contrary to policy as it is not part of the operational area for the quarry.*
- Given the above, an extension to the quarry in this area is considered acceptable in principle.....*
- 2.5 Whilst the application was refused, contrary to the recommendation of the Planning Officer, the reason for refusal was based upon a narrow issue of the proposed extraction area extending to within 200m of sensitive development, albeit the proposed development was confined to a smaller area than the limits of the area identified by Policy SSA25. However, the absence in the reason for refusal of any alleged conflict with policy in the adopted LDP serves to underline the acceptability of a land use allocation for a western extension to the quarry within the development plan.
- 2.6 The refusal of the May 2015 application will be considered via an appeal which has been lodged, but in the interim, in land use planning terms, it is apparent that there has been no change to the acceptability of an allocation of land for mineral extraction within the Policy SSA25 area: the single issue of concern relates to the specific details of the proposed development within the SSA25 policy area rather than to the principle of the development itself.
- 2.7 On this basis, there is no reason not to carry the SSA25 allocation forward into the LDP Review, particularly in the context of the need to release additional reserves of crushed rock within the local authority area, as discussed below.

### **3.0 Regional Technical Statement Second Review (RTS2): October 2020**

- 3.1 MTAN 1 requires the two Regional Aggregate Working Parties (RAWPS) in Wales to produce a Regional Technical Statement (RTS) to ensure that adequate supply can be maintained, taking into account the sustainability objectives set out in MTAN1. The relevant parts of the RTS should then be incorporated into the individual development plans of the respective Authorities (reference MTAN 1 paragraph 50).
- 3.2 In preparing the adopted LDP regard was paid to the content of an initial RTS published in October 2008. In relation to RCT, the 2008 RTS concluded that early consideration should be given to the need to allocate additional reserves likely to be required in the later part of the 15-year plan period (ref recommendation in section 4.28).
- 3.3 As part of the preparation of the RCT LDP, Hanson promoted an extension to Craig yr Hesg quarry as a candidate 'preferred area' for future quarrying on the basis that reserves at the existing quarry were likely to be exhausted during the Plan period, and additional reserves needed to be released to allow continuity of production of this important high specification aggregate material. These representations were accepted and endorsed by an Inspector following an examination of the soundness of the LDP. Consistent with the context provided by the RTS, the adopted LDP (2011) makes provision for a western extension to the quarry within a 'Preferred Area of Known Mineral Resources' (ref Policy SSA25).
- 3.4 Since that time, a First Review of the RTS (RTS1) was published in August 2014, with a Second Review published in October 2020 (RTS2). RTS2 provides the up to date context and evidence base for a mineral supply strategy to be included in the RCT LDP Review.
- 3.5 For RCT, RTS2 identifies an annualised apportionment of 0.753m tonnes of crushed rock as the contribution to be made by RCT to regional aggregate supplies, which for the 25 year provision period of RTS2 (15 years plus a minimum 10 year landbank at the end of the period), requires a minimum provision of 18.816m tonnes. With permitted reserves of 9.83m tonnes at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2016, this equates to a residual requirement to make an allocation for 8.986m tonnes of new crushed rock reserves in the RCT LDP Review.
- 3.6 It should be noted that the 8.896mt was the minimum required allocation as at the end of 2016. The replacement LDP for RCT is scheduled for adoption in 2024, by which time the Authority's crushed rock landbank will have reduced by 8 years or around 6.0m tonnes if consumption remains at around 0.75mt per annum.
- 3.7 In the context of a need for the RCT LDP Review to make provision for some 9 m tonnes (8.986m tonnes) of additional crushed rock aggregate reserves, the Policy SSA25 'preferred area' at Craig yr Hesg Quarry identified in the adopted development plan is currently the only means by which this identified requirement could be fulfilled. This is a compelling justification in its own right to carry forward Policy SSA25 into the LDP Review.


- 3.8 In the absence of such a carry forward of Policy SSA25 (or the unlikely availability of a deliverable resource of 9m tonnes elsewhere in RCT via a competitor Candidate Site), RCT would not be fulfilling its role in making the RTS minimum required contribution to regional supplies, noting the requirement of the recently issued Planning Policy Wales Edition 11 (February 2021) that *“each mineral planning authority should ensure that it makes an appropriate contribution to meeting local, regional and UK needs for primary minerals which reflect the nature and extent of resources in the area...”*(ref para 5.14.10). .
- 3.9 The 15 year period of RTS2 has a commencement date of 31<sup>st</sup> December 2016 and an end date of 31<sup>st</sup> December 2031. The Revised RCT LDP is intended to cover the period 2020 – 2030, although at present it is unclear as to (a)why it does not commence from the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2021 end date of the currently adopted plan or (b) why it is confined to a 10 year period as opposed to the 15 year life of the currently adopted plan. However, the Revised LDP period is broadly consistent with the RTS2 period, and in the absence of any new permitted reserves being added to the RCT landbank since December 2016, it is apparent that the LDP Review will need to make provision for a minimum of 9m tonnes of additional aggregates reserves (with a rolling requirement for a minimum 10 year crushed rock landbank beyond the plan period).
- 3.10 That figure is consistent with the reserves available within the proposed western quarry extension area at Craig-yr-Hesg (as applied for via the May 2015 application) which contains a resource of some 8.9m tonnes within the SSA25 ‘preferred area’, which would also release a reserve of some 1.1 m tonnes within the existing quarry along the boundary between it and the extension area (10.0m tonnes overall).

## **4.0 Conclusions**

- 4.1 The adopted RCT LDP allocates a ‘Preferred Area of Known Mineral Resources’ as for a western extension to Craig yr Hesg Quarry.
- 4.2 The allocation is the only aggregates resource provision made by the adopted LDP, and it represents the core supply strategy of the development plan in terms of RCT’s contribution towards the local, regional and UK supply of aggregates.
- 4.3 The allocation was scrutinized as part of the preparation of the LDP, including an examination into the soundness of the Plan. The Inspector endorsed the inclusion of the SSA25 allocation, and the Plan was adopted accordingly.
- 4.4 There have been no changes in land use circumstances which should result in the Preferred Area of Known Mineral Resources not being carried forward into the LDP Review. The refusal of the May 2015 application for a western extension was based upon the-specific details of that scheme, not the principle of the scheme in terms of the SSA25 allocation, or alleged conflict with any other LDP policy. The outcome of that application (which is currently being appealed) is thus not relevant to the consideration of the land use merits of the SSA25 allocation.

- 4.5 The new RTS2 identifies a need for RCT to allocate a minimum of 9 m tonnes of additional crushed rock reserves over the period of the RTS2 which broadly coincides with the Revised LDP period.
- 4.6 In the absence of any competitor Candidate sites, the Policy SSA25 allocation at Craig yr Hseg Quarry is the only means by which this requirement could be met, and the only means by which RCT can satisfy an obligation to meet its share of regional aggregates supply.
- 4.7 The Policy SSA25 allocation should therefore be carried forward into the LDP review.






F:\MR\South\Sites\Craig-yr-Hesg C10\CAD Drawings\CYHC10 DWGS\C10m131 (Candidate Site Plan for Preferred Area of Known Minerals Resources).dwg

**Legend**

- Candidate Site Boundary ( land to which current LDP Policy SSA25 relates )
- Land owned by the applicant, Hanson UK

  
**Hanson**  
HEIDELBERGCEMENT Group

Site: **Craig Yr Hesg Quarry**

Title: **Candidate Site Plan for Preferred Area of Known Minerals Resources**

Scale: 1:2,500 @ A3	Date: Mar 2021	Drawing No.
Drawn by: MP	Checked by: MF	C10m/131

**From:** Local Development Plan [<mailto:ldp@rctcbc.gov.uk>]

**Sent:** 29 October 2020 08:37

**To:** Local Development Plan

**Subject:** Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Diwygiedig - Rhondda Cynon Taf - Revised Local Development Plan

<u>Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Rhondda Cynon Taf – Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Diwygiedig (2020- 2030) a’r Galw am Safleoedd Ymgeisiol</u>	<u>Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council – Revised Local Development Plan (2020 – 2030) and Call for Candidate Sites</u>
<p>Annwyl Syr/Fadam,</p> <p>Ysgrifennaf atoch i'ch hysbysu y bydd Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Rhondda Cynon Taf yn dechrau Diwygio'n swyddogol eu Cynllun Datblygu Lleol (CDLI) presennol. Bydd y Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Diwygiedig (CDLID) (2020-2030) yn disodli'r CDLI (2006-2021).</p> <p>Yn dilyn cymeradwyaeth y Cyngor ym mis Gorffennaf, cytunodd Llywodraeth Cymru i'r Cytundeb Cyflawni ar gyfer y CDLID ar 14 Medi. Bydd y Diwygiad yn dilyn camau ffurfiol o baratoi drwodd i fabwysiadu yn gynnar yn 2024.</p> <p>Dogfen cynllunio defnydd tir yw'r Cynllun Datblygu Lleol. Mae'n cynnwys gweledigaeth ar gyfer y Fwrdeistref Sirol ac yn dyrannu tir ar gyfer gwaith datblygu, megis tai, cyflogaeth, masnach a thwristiaeth. Mae hefyd yn cynnwys polisiâu er mwyn diogelu'r amgylchedd a chynyddu mannau gwyrdd cyhoeddus, a bydd yn ceisio lleihau allyriadau carbon ac yn annog dulliau addas ar gyfer cynhyrchu ynni adnewyddadwy. Mae'r CDLI yn chwarae rôl arweiniol wrth wneud penderfyniadau mewn perthynas â cheisiadau cynllunio sy'n cael eu gyflwyno i'r Cyngor.</p> <p>Cam cyntaf y broses yw'r cam <b>Galw am Safleoedd Ymgeisiol</b>, ble bydd y Cyngor yn gwahodd unigolion i gyflwyno tir neu adeiladau i'w cynnwys yn y CDLID. Bydd y safleoedd yma'n cael eu hystyried ac os ydyn nhw'n addas byddan nhw'n cael eu cynnwys yn y Cynllun.</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to inform you that Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council are to begin the official Revision of their current Local Development Plan (LDP). The Revised Local Development Plan (RLDP) (2020-2030) will replace the current LDP (2006-2021).</p> <p>Following Council approval in July, Welsh Government then agreed to the Delivery Agreement for the RLDP on September 14. The Revision will follow formal stages of preparation through to adoption in early 2024.</p> <p>The LDP is a statutory land use planning document which sets out a vision for the County Borough and allocates land for development such as housing, employment, retail and tourism. It also has policies to protect the environment and increase public green space and will seek to reduce carbon emissions – whilst encouraging appropriate renewable energy production. The LDP plays a leading role in determining decisions on planning applications to the Council.</p> <p>The first stage of the process is the <b>Call for Candidate Sites</b>, where the Council invites land or buildings to be submitted for inclusion in the RLDP. The sites will be considered, and if appropriate they will be allocated in the Plan.</p>

Mae modd i unrhyw drigolyn gyflwyno safleoedd ar gyfer sawl defnydd, gan gynnwys tîrfeiddianwyr preifat a datblygwyr. Mae canllawiau manwl wedi cael eu llunio gan y Cyngor er mwyn cynorthwyo â'r broses cyflwyno ac asesu safleoedd.

Ceir rhagor o wybodaeth am broses y CDLID yn gyffredinol, a'r Alwad am Safleoedd Ymgeisiol penodol (a sut i'w cyflwyno), ar ein gwefan yn y lleoliad canlynol:

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/CY/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/RevisedLocalDevelopmentPlan20202030/RevisedLocalDevelopmentPlan20202030.aspx>

Y cam Galw am Safleoedd Ymgeisiol yw'r cam ymgysylltu ac ymgynghori cyntaf yn rhan o'r broses o baratoi ar gyfer diwygio'r Cynllun Datblygu Lleol. Bydd y safleoedd sy'n cael eu cyflwyno'n cael eu hasesu a'u cynnwys ar Gofrestr Safleoedd Ymgeisiol. Cyhoeddir hyn ochr yn ochr â'r cam 'Strategaeth a Ffefrir' y CDLID, a gaiff ei baratoi ei hun dros y flwyddyn i ddod. Bydd copi drafft o'r Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Diwygiedig yn cael ei lunio ac yn destun ymgynghori yn 2022, cyn i'r cynllun gael ei ystyried gan Arolygydd Cynllunio annibynnol yn 2023.

Byddwn yn parhau i ymgynghori â chi ar wahanol gamau proses baratoi'r CDLID dros y misoedd a'r blynnyddoedd nesaf. Efallai y gofynnir i chi hefyd gymryd rhan yng nghamau'r broses yn y dyfodol, ar yr un adeg â'ch bod yn barod, wrth gwrs.

Fodd bynnag, os nad ydych am cael eich ymgynghori mwyach ar CDLID Rhondda Cynon Taf, neu os oes gennych unrhyw ymholiadau pellach mewn perthynas ag ef fel arall, ymatebwch i'r e-bost hwn yn unol â hynny.

Sites can be submitted by all, including private landowners and developers, and also for a range of uses. In-depth guidance has been prepared by the Council to assist in the submission and assessment of sites.

Further information regarding the RLDP process in general and the specific Call for Candidate Sites, (and how to submit them), can be seen on our website at the following location:

<https://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/EN/Resident/PlanningandBuildingControl/RevisedLocalDevelopmentPlan20202030/RevisedLocalDevelopmentPlan20202030.aspx>

The Call for Candidate Sites is the first of many phases of engagement and consultation in the RLDP preparation process. The sites put forward will be assessed and collated into a Candidate Sites Register. This will be published alongside the 'Preferred Strategy' stage of the RLDP, which itself will be prepared over the coming year. A Deposit RLDP will then be produced and consulted upon in 2022, before being considered by an independent Planning Inspector in 2023.

You will continue to be consulted on the various stages of the RLDP preparation process over coming months and years. You may also be asked to be involved and engaged in the future stages of the process, subject to yourselves being willing, of course.

If, however, you no longer wish to be consulted on the Rhondda Cynon Taf RLDP, or if you otherwise have any further queries in relation to it, please respond to this email accordingly.

Cofion cynnes | Kind regards,

**Polisi Cynllunio | Planning Policy**

**Uwchadran Ffyniant a Datblygiad | Prosperity and Development Division**

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Rhondda Cynon Taf | Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council  
Tŷ Sardis House, Heol Sardis Road, Pontypridd, CF37 1DU

Ffôn/Telephone: 01443 281129 | Ebst/Email: [ldp@rctcbc.gov.uk](mailto:ldp@rctcbc.gov.uk)

Gwefan/Website: <http://www.rctcbc.gov.uk/planning>